Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

SHOUT
SHARE
IT

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

DEPARTMENT BULLETIN No. 1443

Washington, D. C. November, 1926

CONSUMER HABITS AND PREFERENCES IN THE PURCHASE AND CONSUMPTION OF MEAT

By

KELSEY B. GARDNER, Associate Economic Analyst, and LAWRENCE A. ADAMS
formerly Associate Economic Analyst, Bureau of Agricultural Economics

CONTENTS

	Page
Relation of Consumer to Production and Consumption	1
Scope and Nature of Study	2
Cities Covered	2
Population Groups	3
Number of Questionnaires	4
The Consumer Questionnaire	5
Collection of Information	5
Results of the Survey	6
Method of Presentation	6
Replies to Questions	7
Summary of Results	34
Questionnaire	37
Tables	39

WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1926

A SURVEY of the retail marketing of meat was provided for by Congress in the act making appropriations for the United States Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1924–25. Further appropriation for this work was provided for the year 1925–26. The survey was divided into three parts: (1) Methods and practices; (2) margins, expenses, and profits; and (3) consumer habits and preferences in the purchase and consumption of meat. A study of these factors and of their influence upon the market for meat constituted the general plan as a whole. The first part of the study is reported in Department Bulletin No. 1441, and the second part in Department Bulletin No. 1442. The third part, relating to consumer habits and preferences in the purchase and consumption of meat, is covered in this bulletin.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

DEPARTMENT BULLETIN No. 1443

Washington, D. C. ▼ November, 1926

CONSUMER HABITS AND PREFERENCES IN THE PURCHASE AND CONSUMPTION OF MEAT [1]

By KELSEY B. GARDNER, *Associate Economic Analyst*, and LAWRENCE A. ADAMS, formerly *Associate Economic Analyst, Bureau of Agricultural Economics*

CONTENTS

	Page
Relation of consumer to production and consumption	1
Scope and nature of study	2
Cities covered	2
Population groups	3
Number of questionnaires	4
The consumer questionnaire	5
Collection of information	5
Results of the survey	6
Method of presentation	6
Replies to questions	7
Summary of results	34
Meat consumption	34
Meat purchasing	35
Meat advertising	36
Consumer knowledge of meat quality and cuts	36
Questionnaire	37
Tables	39

RELATION OF CONSUMER TO PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION

Producer, distributor, and consumer are concerned in varying degree with production and distribution problems. Of these three groups, the consumer is recognized as the one wielding the strongest influence not only because it is in this group that consumption of products takes place but because of the effect of consumer preferences and demands in the determination of production and distribution methods and practices.

The importance of consumer demand in the production and marketing of meat is unquestioned. Consumer preferences for the various kinds and cuts of meat are influences of the highest importance to producers of meat animals and to distributors of meat and meat products. More definite knowledge of these consumer preferences and buying habits in the purchasing and consumption of meat should be of aid in adjusting production and distribution methods to meet consumer demand and in developing programs of education designed to eliminate some of the lack of consumer knowledge which now renders consumers peculiarly susceptible to unwitting purchase of meats and meat products of inferior quality.

[1] This survey was planned and organized by J. Clyde Marquis, agricultural economist; the field work of gathering the materials was supervised by Lawrence A. Adams; the data were analyzed and the manuscript was prepared by Kelsey B. Gardner. Mayme C. Parker assisted in compiling the data and in making the computations.

15287°—26——1

The retailing agency, which comes in closest contact with the consumer, first feels the effect of these preferences of the consumer and recognizes them as consumer likes and dislikes. The contact is direct and any adjustments which the retailer makes in answer to the demand are accomplished in response to definite consumer wishes.

Adjustments to changes in consumer demand by producers and distributors who do not come directly in contact with the consumer are brought about in less direct manner than in the case of the retailer. The producer to whom the change in demand is finally transmitted through successive agencies may receive it in the form of price variation which, in all probability he does not recognize as a result of a change in consumer preferences.

Consumer demand for a commodity may be expressed in several forms. The quantity taken by the consumer group may vary with changes in quality or price. There may be an actual shift to some other commodity, if quality or price is not in agreement with consumer preference and a substitute is available. Or consumer demand may be expressed in the form of complaints against price or quality without any consequent variation in the quantity of the commodity taken. Further, consumer demand may be related not so much to the commodity itself as to the services rendered in connection with its distribution. The preference for packaged goods instead of the same goods in bulk is a familiar example. Again, the retailer may be asked to extend further delivery or charge service, all of which are phases of consumer demand.

The retailing of meat is subject to the conditions imposed by consumer demand, but study of this phase of meat distribution has been given little attention heretofore. Accordingly, when appropriation was made by Congress for a study of the retailing of meat in 1924–25 and again for a continuation of the study in 1925–26, a portion of the study thus provided for was devoted to meat-consumer habits and preferences.

It should be made clear at the outset that this study was not directed toward the determination of the relation of variation in quantity demand to price changes. On the contrary, the aim of the study was to obtain information which might make clearer some of the purchasing habits of housewives; their knowledge concerning grades, quality, and cuts of meat; and their preferences for various kinds and cuts of meat and use of meat in the household. All of these are of effect in bringing about some of our present methods of retail meat distribution.

SCOPE AND NATURE OF STUDY

CITIES COVERED

Personal interviews with housewives by representatives of the United States Department of Agriculture were the means adopted for obtaining statements of meat consumer practices and opinions. This work was carried out in 16 representative cities, which were chosen to bring out regional differences and some of the racial or nationality distinctions which might exist in the purchasing and consumption of meat. These cities were: Baltimore, Md., Binghamton, N. Y., Birmingham, Ala., Denver, Colo., Fargo and Grand Forks,

N. D., Jacksonville, Fla., Lincoln, Nebr., Minneapolis, Minn., New Haven, Conn., New Orleans, La., Oklahoma City, Okla., Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, Pa., San Francisco, Calif., and Washington, D. C.

POPULATION GROUPS

Variations in meat-consumer practices arise through such differences as race, nationality, and income. In order that these variations might be disclosed, it was necessary to interview families of different population groups and to analyze the questionnaires from these groups separately.

The population groups and group subdivisions of importance in the 16 cities were as follows:

American white group:
- Poor class.
- Middle class.
- Well-to-do class.
- Wealthy class.

Colored group:
- Poor class.
- Middle class.

Foreign groups:
- English.
- Finnish.
- French.
- German.
- Italian.
- Jewish
- Polish.
- Russian.
- Scandinavian.

Foreign families which had retained to marked extent the habits and customs of other countries were chosen. This was the primary distinction between the American white group and the foreign groups.

As the standard of living varies according to income and social position, the four subdivisions were made within the American white group.

POOR CLASS

The poor class consisted of families [2] living in the poorest white sections of the cities and whose family incomes were very limited.

MIDDLE CLASS

The middle class was the artisan group. Families of this class lived in modest homes in the poorer white residential sections of the cities.

WELL-TO-DO CLASS

Salaried and professional workers and their families made up the larger portion of the well-to-do group. Such families had fair incomes and found it possible to maintain some social position.

WEALTHY CLASS

Wealthy families were those with incomes sufficiently large to live in the most exclusive sections of the cities and to employ servants.

It is worth while to emphasize that the distinction on which these four classes was based was one of standard of living rather than abso-

[2] Two people or more living together were taken as the family unit. The word "family" is not used here in the sense of the natural family, but rather as a group of persons living together and constituting the membership of the household. For the purposes of this survey the words "family" and "household" may be regarded as interchangeable, unless the context indicates otherwise. No boarding houses were included under this classification. Families with one or two persons boarding with them were classed as families and not as boarding houses.

lute income. It was understood that some members of the middle class had incomes larger than some members of the well-to-do class. In establishing the classification of the family the interviewer was guided by the housewife's statement of the occupation of the husband or wage earner of the family and by other observable factors, such as the residential area in which the home was located and the general characteristics and appearance of the home itself. The housewives interviewed were selected at random.

In the negro or colored group only the poor and middle classes were interviewed. These classifications corresponded to those defined for the American white group.

In the foreign group, division was made by nationality only. No attempt was made to set up income or standard of living groups. Effort was made, however, to obtain for each group questionnaires from families representative of the entire group.

NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRES

Four thousand four hundred and sixty-six housewives were interviewed in the 16 cities. The members of the households which these housewives represented totaled 20,744 persons. (Table 1.)

The distribution of the questionnaires by city and by group and class is shown in Table 2. It will be noted in this table that for the most part the questionnaires for any one class totaled about 50 for each city, although there was some variation from this number. It has been found in previous surveys of somewhat similar character that a group of about 50 replies gathered at random was sufficiently representative of one population class in a single city. This basis of collecting questionnaires resulted in obtaining about 200 in each city when all the four classes of the American white group were interviewed. If any colored or foreign groups were surveyed, the total number of questionnaires for the city was increased correspondingly.

Housewives in 2,912 American white households were interviewed. Of this total, 751 were of the poor class, 782 of the middle class, 796 of the well-to-do class, and 583 of the wealthy class. In the colored group, 203 housewives of the poor class and 197 of the middle class were interviewed, a total of 400. In the foreign group, there were interviewed 100 English housewives, 45 Finnish, 50 French, 175 German, 276 Italian, 113 Jewish, 195 Polish, 50 Russian, and 150 Scandinavian, a total of 1,154 housewives for the entire group.

Particular attention is called to the fact that all 16 cities were not represented in all population groups or group subdivisions. However, in each table in which are presented the results of this investigation, it should be understood that, unless otherwise stated in the heading or footnotes of the table, the cities included in the data were those listed in Table 2.

The number of replies for several questions sometimes varied from that indicated in Table 2. These differences were partly accounted for by the fact that some of the questions were not answered because of inability of the interviewers to obtain satisfactory replies from all housewives for all questions. Other factors which contributed to the variation in the number of replies were the changes made in the questionnaire after the survey had been completed in Baltimore, Binghamton, New Haven, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh, and partially

finished in Washington, which were the first cities in which the study was conducted. Certain of the questions asked in these cities were eliminated from the final form and other questions which were not in the first form were added to the final form of the questionnaire.

THE CONSUMER QUESTIONNAIRE

The questions forming the questionnaire were developed after tests of several questionnaires in six cities. In its final form the questionnaire included those questions for which it was believed satisfactory and reliable answers could be obtained. The questions were so framed as to include not only those relating to actual practices in the purchase and consumption but also others indicating housewives' opinions and viewpoints in the purchasing and consumption of meat.

For the purposes of the survey, fish and poultry were not regarded as meat and were classed as other foods. Particular emphasis was placed on fresh meat as distinguished from smoked and cured meats.

The nature and extent of the information gathered through the questionnaire will be more readily grasped by a statement of its general content. A summary [3] of the questions follows:

Value of meat consumed weekly by families or households.
Number of family members.
Age and sex of family members.
Number of servants in the household.
Family and other household members eating and not eating meat.
Reasons why adults do not eat meat.
Kind of meat preferred.
Reasons for buying steaks, chops, roasts, and boiling meat.
Number of times per week meat was served at breakfast, lunch, and dinner.
Reasons for serving meat in preference to other foods.
Foods served in place of meat and reasons for their use.
Relative importance of various foods in the household.
Housewife's opinion as to whether the family eats too much meat, just enough, or not enough, and reasons for stating too much or too little meat.
Type of market patronized, reasons for buying at a particular market and for changing markets.
Familiarity of housewives with local advertising.
Purchasing habits of housewives.
Housewives' knowledge of various cuts of meat.

It is apparent in collecting information concerning consumer preferences and opinions by several observers that arbitrary and rigid restrictions must be placed on the meaning of the question, in order that all interviewers may place the same interpretation on each question. These definitions and limitations will be indicated whenever necessary in the discussion of each of the various questions.

COLLECTION OF INFORMATION

The nature of the questions to be asked at the personal interviews required the use of trained interviewers, who would be able to rephrase or to explain a question sufficiently to get satisfactory replies without actually suggesting the answer. These interviewers were accordingly instructed and their work directed so that the results obtained by the various workers might be properly compared and combined.

[3] A list of the questions for which results are presented in this publication is given in the questionnaire, pages 37 and 38. Some variation will be noted between the wording of certain of the questions and that used in the tables and in the discussion of the questions. A restatement of the questions seemed necesssary in order that the questions might clearly indicate their meanings when removed from the other questions with which they were associated in the questionnaire.

The same questionnaire was used for all groups, so that variations noted among the groups in the replies to the same question were indicative of the differences arising through race, nationality, or differences in standards of living.

In the conduct of this survey only those families that consumed meat were interviewed. Strict vegetarian families were not interviewed. Families using meat in small quantities were included.

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

METHOD OF PRESENTATION

The principal form of presentation of housewives' replies to the questionnaires is the summary table in which results for a single question from various cities were combined by population groups and group subdivisions. In compiling these summary tables no attempt was made to bring out the differences in consumer demand among cities, but to disclose these differences the replies to certain questions were arranged by cities. In the city tables there has not been complete presentation of all data for all groups and classes for each city. Only the combined total number of replies from housewives of the middle and well-to-do classes of the American white group has been shown. It was believed that the two classes would more truly indicate the differences among cities in consumer preferences and buying habits, as they seemed to constitute the most representative portion of each city's population, when judged from the standpoints of race, nationality, and standard of living.

The usual unit in the tables is the family or household. In nearly all of the tables the number of replies was based on the family or household, since most of the questions related to the household and not to the individual members. The few exceptions will be noted as the questions and tables are discussed.

In presenting the analysis, the number of housewives giving the same answer to a question was expressed as a percentage of the total number of housewives replying to the question. This use of percentages permits direct comparisons among different population groups for which the number of replies varied greatly. Reference to the total number of replies to any question for any population group or class will indicate the extent of the data on which the conclusions were based.

It should be made clear that the percentages were calculated to the first decimal place, not because the data justified such accuracy but because of the mathematical necessity of having the various percentages relating to the several answers to a question total 100 per cent. Since some of the answers occurred in small numbers and constituted at times less than 1 per cent of the total replies, the use of tenths of 1 per cent was desirable in indicating the relative importance of these answers.

No relations were apparent among many of the phases of this study of consumer demand, and at this stage of investigations of this character it was necessary to present the results for many questions separately without relating them to other questions. Each of the questions is therefore presented as a separate unit; but where relations were thought to exist between various questions, they have been pointed out.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Question 1.—(*a*) How many persons in your family (other than servants)?
(*b*) How many servants eating two or more meals daily? (Table 1.)

In compiling the replies to this question, no distinction was made between members of natural families and any servants who might be employed in the household, since it was the experience of the household which was of first interest. The portions of the meat consumption attributable to the natural family members and to the servants could not be determined, and it was necessary to include the total number of persons composing the household.

The total number of persons reached by the survey is shown in Table 1 by group and class divisions. A total of 20,744 persons comprised the 4,466 households whose housewives were interviewed. Of this total, 13,369 were of the American white group. Within this group, 3,654 persons were in the 751 households of the poor class, 3,177 in the 782 middle-class households, 3,354 in the 796 well-to-do households, and 3,184 in the 583 wealthy households.

In the colored group, 805 persons composed the 203 households of the poor class, and 818 persons made up the membership of the 197 middle-class households. A total of 1,623 persons were in the 400 households of this group.

One thousand one hundred and fifty-four households of the foreign group were visited. The number of persons composing these households was 5,752. The size of the foreign groups varied considerably. In order of total number of persons in each group the array of the group was as follows: Italian, 1,583 persons in 276 households; Polish, 1,057 persons in 195 households; German, 768 persons in 175 households; Scandinavian, 625 persons in 150 households; Jewish, 534 persons in 113 households; English, 413 persons in 100 households; Russian, 308 persons in 50 households; French, 256 persons in 50 households; Finnish, 208 persons in 45 households.

The distribution by cities of the households visited is indicated in Table 2.

Considerable variation among the groups and classes was observed in the size of household. The average number of persons per household for the American white group was 4.6. Of this group the wealthy class households had an average membership of 5.5 persons, the largest average in the four classes composing the group. The large number of persons found for the wealthy group was occasioned by the number of servants. In the middle and well-to-do classes the difference in the average number per household was slight, the middle class averaging 4.1 and the well-to-do class 4.2.

For the colored group the average size of household was 4.1 persons. The poor class averaged 4 persons to the household, while the average middle-class household consisted of 4.2 people. The average number of persons in the middle-class household of the colored group thus closely approximated the average size of household in the same class in the American white group, which averaged 4.1 persons. The poor class of the colored group averaged 0.9 person less than the corresponding class in the American white group.

In the foreign group the general average was 5 persons to the household. Considerable variation was found among the averages of the nine nationalities composing this group. When the several

nationalities were arrayed in order by size of household, the Russians were found to be first, with an average of 6.2 persons.

Question 2.—What is the cost of the meat consumed per week in your household? (Table 3.)

The average cost of the meat used per week in 2,479 American white homes was $3.49. For the poor-class households of this group the cost averaged $2.73. The middle-class household's average of $3.13 was somewhat higher. The well-to-do class household averaged $3.50 and the average cost in the wealthy group of households was $5.03.

The cost of the meat consumed per week per household in American white homes showed a definite relation to the standard-of-living groups established since the cost per week increased as the standard of living increased.

In the colored group the poor class averaged $0.32 less than the poor-class household of the American white group, but the middle class of the colored group had an average cost per household which was $0.25 per week greater than the corresponding class of households in the American white group.

In the foreign group, meat consumption when measured by household expenditures per week varied greatly. The Russian families spent a weekly average per family of $3.96 for meat. The Polish and German group averages were practically the same, $3.25 for the Polish and $3.24 for the German. The Finnish group expenditure averaged $2.40, the Scandinavian $2.31, and the Italian $2.16.

The cost figures presented in Table 3 were secured as estimates from the housewives interviewed. Since most of the housewives were unable to answer this question immediately, it was necessary to use some method by which this information could be determined. The week preceding the time of the interview was selected as a basis. The housewife was asked to give the quantities and cost of the various kinds of meat used during this period of time. Thus there were secured the quantities of beefsteaks and other cuts of beef, lamb chops and other cuts of lamb, pork, veal, smoked and cured meats, and other kinds of meat not previously included. Each interviewer was instructed to be sufficiently familiar with local prices to check the housewife's statement of the cost based on the quantities consumed.

Question 3.—(*a*) Do you think your family eats too much meat? Just enough? Not enough?
(*b*) If too much or not enough, why?

The questions relating to the housewife's opinion regarding whether the family or household as a unit consumed too much, just enough, or not enough meat were asked in an effort to secure direct statements indicative of the housewife's attitude toward the quantities of meat consumed by the household. Variations among the groups were slight. Accordingly the data are not presented in table form.

The majority of all housewives answering the question stated that they thought their families ate just enough meat. In the American white group, 85.4 per cent of the housewives thought that just enough meat was consumed in their households, 13 per cent thought too much meat was consumed, and 1.6 per cent were of the opinion that too little meat was used. The percentage distribution of the

replies of the colored housewives was similar to that of the American white group, 83.5 per cent stating that they believed just enough meat was consumed. In the foreign groups, 95.4 per cent of the Finnish housewives, 94 per cent of the French, 90.4 per cent of the German, 87.5 per cent of the Italian, 94 per cent of the Russian, and 89.2 per cent of the Scandinavian housewives said that they believed just enough meat was consumed.

Of those replying that too much meat was consumed in their households, and assigning reasons for their replies with the exception of one group, 80–91 per cent of the total number gave reasons indicating that they believed that the quantities consumed were too large to be healthful. The exception noted was the Scandinavian group, in which 67 per cent of the total replies indicated that too much meat was consumed to be healthful.

The number of those replying that they believed that too little meat was consumed in their households was small and the number of those assigning reasons for this answer was still smaller. But, there seemed to be evident a tendency for the proportion of those replying "not enough" to decrease as the income or standard of living of the group became better. The few replies in which reasons were stated were indicative of the opinion that the cost of meat was beyond the means of the family. These reasons were given primarily by housewives of the poor classes of the American white and colored groups, and by those of the Italian group.

Question 4.—(*a*) How many men eat meat? How many do not?
(*b*) How many women eat meat? How many do not?
(*c*) How many children 15 to 19 eat meat? How many do not?
(*d*) How many children 10 to 14 eat meat? How many do not?
(*e*) How many children 5 to 9 eat meat? How many do not?
(*f*) How many children under 5 eat meat? How many do not?
(*g*) How many servants eat meat? How many do not?
(Table 4).

The replies to the seven parts of the question relative to persons not eating meat are presented in Table 4. This table was based on the meat-eating habits of 16,347 persons, of whom 10,575 were of the American white group, 1,620 of the colored group, 3,278 of the foreign group, and 874 servants. The total number of persons was smaller than that in Table 1, where a total of 20,744 was indicated. The smaller figures thus shown in Table 4 were due to two principal factors: (1) Philadelphia and Pittsburgh were not included in these figures, since the questionnaire used in these two cities did not provide for the securing of this information, and (2) in some few instances it was not possible to secure a satisfactory answer to this question from the housewives. But, the extent of the group of individuals on which this table was based was for the most part sufficiently comprehensive to be of significance.

The number of people actually eating meat has not been indicated in the table, but the relative number eating meat may be readily inferred from the percentage figures indicative of those not eating meat.

In the American white group, the number of persons not eating meat averaged 5.5 per cent of the total. In the various classes of this group the percentages indicating the numbers not eating meat decreased as the standard of living increased. For the poor class

6.8 per cent of the total number of persons in the households did not eat meat; in the middle class, 6.3 per cent; in the well-to-do class, 4.7 per cent; and in the wealthy class, 3.4 per cent. These differences appeared to be explained for the most part by the larger proportion of children in the poor, middle, and well-to-do classes.

Children under 5 years of age were the largest group of household members not eating meat, so that as the percentage of children of this age increased the percentage of the people not eating meat increased also. In the poor class, about 14.5 per cent of the total membership of the class was composed of children under 5 years of age. In the middle, well-to-do, and wealthy classes, the similar values were about 8, 6, and 8 per cent. Another factor contributing to the decrease noted for the wealthy class was the fact that of the children under 5 years of age in this class only 20.9 per cent did not eat meat, whereas in each of the other three classes the percentage of children under 5 years not eating meat was over 34 per cent of the total number of children in each group.

Within the American white group, the larger relative numbers not eating meat were found to be in the group of children 9 years of age and under and in the group of adult women. Of the total number of children under 5 years in the group, 34.1 per cent did not eat meat. About 3.9 per cent of the children between the ages of 5 and 9 did not eat meat and 3.4 per cent of the women over 19 years of age did not eat meat. The other age groups showed but little variation, 1.6 per cent of the men over 19 years did not eat meat, and a similar per cent of the children between 15 and 19 years of age did not eat meat. Of the group of children between 10 and 14 years of age, 1.2 per cent did not eat meat.

A slight increase in the tendency to eat meat was noted in the group of adult men of the American white class as the standard of living increased, but an opposite tendency was observed in the group of women over 19 years of age.

In all age divisions of both the poor and middle classes of the colored group the percentages of those not eating meat, were less than the corresponding percentages of the American white group.

In eight foreign groups, the order of array of the total number of persons not eating meat, when expressed as percentages of the total number of persons in the households visited, was as follows: French, 8.9 per cent; Polish, 8.4 per cent; Jewish, 7.1 per cent; Italian, 4.9 per cent; Scandinavian, 4.2 per cent; German, 3.4 per cent; Russian, 1.9 per cent; and Finnish, 0.5 per cent. With the exception of the Jewish group, the higher percentages were to be attributed largely to the proportionately larger numbers of children of the younger ages who did not eat meat. The number of men who did not eat meat in the Russian, Polish, and German households was less in proportion to the total number of men in each of these groups than in the other nationality groups.

Question 5.—If there are any adults who do not eat meat, what are the reasons why they do not? (Table 5.)

Replies to this question were few in number, because the scope of the question was limited to adults. For the American white group, the reason most frequently assigned by those not eating meat was that they excluded it from their diet, either because of doctors' orders

or because of personal opinions regarding its healthfulness. Of the 196 adults answering the question, 73.4 per cent gave dietary reasons. The next most important reason numerically was that of not caring for meat. This reply group included the vegetarians who were found in the households visited.

In the poor class, 5.4 per cent of those replying stated that they did not eat meat because of its high cost.

Replies to this question by the Jewish, German, Italian, and Scandinavian members of the foreign group were the only ones in which the number of replies was sufficent to justify consideration. Of the four, the Jewish, German, and Scandinavian replies were in agreement with the results obtained from housewives of the American white group. The Italian housewives indicated a decided tendency toward emphasizing vegetarian habits.

Question 6.—What kind of meat is preferred in your household? (Tables 6, 7, and 8.)

In Table 6 a summary of the meat preferences of the various groups based on the household as a unit is shown. In Table 7, preferences of households in 12 cities are shown by cities. In Table 8, preferences of the individual members of a limited number of households are presented for Baltimore, Binghamton, Jacksonville, and New Haven.

Beef was the preferred meat in 66.4 per cent of the 2,270 households of the American white group. Preferences for pork totaled 16.8 per cent of the total number of replies. The number of households preferring lamb was 9.9 per cent of the total while the indicated preference for veal was but 6.9 per cent of the total number of replies.

When the classes of the American white group were taken separately, it was found that there was a gradual increase in the preference for beef as the standard of living increased. At the same time the preference for pork decreased materially. The preference for pork in the poor class, when measured as a percentage of the total number of replies, was 35.2 per cent, for the middle class, 18.7 per cent, for the well-to-do class, 7.9 per cent, and for the wealthy class, 5.2 per cent.

The preference for lamb in the American white group became more pronounced as the standard of living increased. This increase, together with the decrease in the preference for pork indicated previously, was attributed largely to the effect of price variation between the two commodities. Pork found favor among the households of the poor class because of its lower price. Lamb found favor in the wealthy households because preference outweighed price considerations.

Veal was preferred in about the same relative amounts by all classes of the American white group.

In the colored group, decided increases in the preferences for pork and veal were found. The number in the poor class preferring pork was 61.4 per cent of the total number of replies, while the corresponding percentage in the American white poor class was but 35.2. The effects of these increased preferences for pork and veal were apparent in material decreases in the preferences for beef. Only 23.3 per cent of the colored poor-class housewives stated that they preferred

beef, while 55.3 per cent of the American white poor-class housewives indicated beef as the first choice of their households.

Among the various foreign groups some important variations from the preferences found in the American white group were noted. The Finnish, Russian, and Scandinavian groups showed important preferences for pork. Twenty-four and four-tenths per cent of the total replies in the group of Finns, 28 per cent of the Russians, and 37.8 per cent of the Scandinavians indicated preference for pork.

The preference for veal was notably greater in some of the foreign groups than in the American white or colored groups. Finns indicated a preference for veal of 24.5 per cent of the total replies, French 42 per cent, Italians 43.5 per cent, and Russians 20 per cent.

The figures shown in Table 7 are the combined total of replies of housewives of the middle and well-to-do classes of the American white group. The replies of these two subdivisions of the American white group were selected as the most representative portion of the data secured from each city and were used to indicate differences among the various cities. Replies representative of 12 cities are thus shown in Table 7.

Of the 1,155 replies for the 12 cities, 69.5 per cent indicated beef as first choice. Pork was second with 13.2 per cent. Preferences for lamb averaged 9.8 per cent and for veal 7.5 per cent of the total replies. Variations from these averages were marked; that is, of the replies from Denver, 84.2 per cent showed beef as first choice, while only 45 of the 100 housewives of New Orleans replying to the question stated that beef was preferred in their households.

Preferences for pork as indicated by the replies also varied widely. In Grand Forks, 28.3 per cent of the housewives gave pork as the preferred meat in their households. In Oklahoma City, the corresponding percentage was 21.3, in Fargo, 20.2. Pork was preferred least in the households of San Francisco, where only 4.1 per cent of the 97 housewives stated that pork was preferred.

In San Francisco and Philadelphia households, lamb was preferred to a larger extent than in the remaining 10 cities. Thirty-three per cent of the 97 housewives in San Francisco gave lamb as the preferred meat in their households while 25 per cent of the 92 replies from Philadelphia indicated lamb as first choice.

Veal was preferred by the members of 45 per cent of the households in New Orleans, which was the outstanding city in its preference for veal. The next highest indicated preference was in Fargo where 8.5 per cent of the housewives stated that veal was preferred in their households.

The data presented in Table 8 were to a large extent corroborative of the replies previously shown in Table 6. In Table 8 preferences are expressed for the individual members of the households. At the outset of the survey the question relating to preference for beef, pork, lamb, or veal was asked regarding each member of the household. It is these replies from Baltimore, Binghamton, Jacksonville, and New Haven which are presented in Table 8. These replies were found to be to a very marked degree in agreement with those determined for 12 cities in which the household was used as the unit of preference rather than the preferences of the individual members of the households.

The tendency toward a decreasing preference for pork and an increasing preference for lamb with increases in the standard of living was noted in the three classes of the American white group. In the colored group, which was located in Jacksonville (Table 8), some variations from the results presented in Table 6 were found. In the poor class of this group the preference for beef was higher and that for pork somewhat lower than was shown for the colored group located in Birmingham, New Orleans, and Washington. (Table 6.) In the middle class of the colored group the preferences for both pork and lamb were larger in Jacksonville than in the other three cities. In the colored households of Birmingham, New Orleans, and Washington, 10.7 per cent of the poor-class housewives preferred veal and 17 per cent of those in the middle class stated a similar preference for their households. In Jacksonville, however, no preferences were stated for veal in either the poor or middle class of the colored group.

The Italian groups in Baltimore and Binghamton (Table 8) and in Denver, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and San Francisco (Table 6) indicated about the same relative preferences for beef and veal. The principal variation of the Italian from the American white group was the high percentage of the total number of replies indicating veal as first choice in the Italian households.

The primary differences between the Polish group in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh (Table 6) and that in Baltimore and Binghamton (Table 8) were the decreased preference for beef and the increase in the preference for pork in Baltimore and Binghamton. In neither of the groups was any preference stated for lamb.

Question 7.—Why do you buy—(*a*) steaks and chops, (*b*) roasts, and (*c*) boiling meat? (Tables 9, 10, and 11.)

The variations in demand for different cuts of meat and particularly those of the beef carcass have resulted in rather wide price differentials between the more favored and the less favored cuts. These differences have been the subject of much discussion and some investigation, but the consumer reasons prompting the purchase and use of the different cuts have been given little attention. Accordingly questions directed toward determining these reasons were incorporated in the questionnaire used in Baltimore, Binghamton, Jacksonville, New Haven, and Washington. Tables 9, 10, and 11 were based on these replies.

Housewives of the American white group in answering the three parts of this question gave as the principal answer for each section of the question that they liked the particular cut of meat to which the question related. The significance of this reply common to all parts of the question rested in the decreasing relation which the number of housewives giving this as the reason bore to the total number of replies, when the replies to the three parts of the question were considered together.

In the American white group the total number of housewives of the three classes—poor, middle, and well-to-do—replying to the first part of the question was 625, 62 per cent of whom stated that they purchased steaks and chops because they liked them. Of the 517, housewives who answered the part of the question relating to the reasons for buying roasts, 40 per cent gave as their reason that they

bought roasts because they liked them. Of the 333 housewives answering the third part of the question only 29.4 per cent stated that they bought boiling beef because they liked it.

Roasts and boiling meat were bought more frequently to provide variety in the menu than were steaks and chops. Expressed in percentage of total replies in each case, 17.1 per cent of the housewives stated that they bought steaks and chops for variety, while 27 per cent gave variety as the reason for purchasing roasts and 25.2 per cent gave the same reason for the purchase of boiling meat.

Convenience of preparation was an important factor in the choice of steaks and chops, 12.6 per cent of the housewives of the American white group giving this as their reason for buying steaks and chops. But 5.4 per cent stated that they bought roasts for this reason, while only 1.2 per cent gave this as the reason for buying boiling meat.

Food value, health, and habit were reasons assigned by some of the housewives, but the differences between the percentages of replies to the three parts of the question were slight.

Economy was stressed as the reason for the purchase of roasts and boiling meat. Of the housewives replying, 12 per cent gave this as their reason for using roasts, 7.5 per cent gave the same reason for serving boiling meat and only 1.3 per cent stated that they bought steaks and chops for reasons of economy.

Large families and the necessity of providing meat for more than one meal economically were reasons assigned by 1.6 and 7.2 per cent of the housewives who stated these reasons for buying roasts. Neither of these reasons was given for purchasing steaks and chops although an answer related to size of family was stated when 2.2 per cent of the housewives said that they bought steaks and chops because of the small size of their households.

Of the housewives replying, 29.5 per cent gave as their reason for buying boiling meat, that they combined these cuts with other foods.

Replies from the colored group in Jacksonville and the Polish group in Baltimore and Binghamton are also presented. The number of replies from these groups was small and the variations from the replies indicated for the American white group were of little importance.

In general, the replies from the American white groups in Baltimore, Jacksonville, New Haven, and Washington were in fair agreement. The few Washington replies showed considerable variation from those of the four other cities at times, properly attributed, in all probability, to the small number of replies.

Question 8.—How many times a week is meat served at the following meals: Breakfast, lunch or supper, and dinner? (Tables 12 and 13.)

For the purposes of this question dinner was understood to be the most important meal of the day, regardless of whether it occurred at noon or evening. The use of bacon, ham, salt meat, etc., was regarded as the serving of meat.

In the American white group replies from 2,862 housewives were secured. In these households the average number of times meat was served at breakfast and at lunch or supper was 2.1 times per week per household for each of these meals and for dinner 5.6 times. Some variations were found in the number of times per week meat was served by the classes within this group. The poor class served meat for breakfast 1.8 times per week per household on the average; the

middle class, 1.9 times; the well-to-do class, 2.1 times, and the wealthy class, 2.6 times.

A situation almost the reverse of this was found to exist with relation to the serving of meat at lunch or supper. The poor class averaged 2.1 times per week; the middle class, 2.5 times; while the well-to-do and wealthy classes' averages were 1.8 times.

The use of meat at dinner was greatest in well-to-do and wealthy households where it was served an average of 5.8 times per week, although the middle class average was approximately the same.

In the colored group the important variations from the averages in the poor and middle classes of the American white group were found in the use of meat for breakfast. In the foreign group use of meat at breakfast varied widely. The Jewish group averaged 0.1 time per week; Finnish and Scandinavian groups, 0.5 time; Italian, 0.6 time; German, 0.7 time; Russian, 0.8 time; Polish, 1.0; French, 1.1, and the English, 1.7 times.

At lunch the Jewish average per week was lowest, 0.6 time, and the Russian group was highest with an average of 3.2 times per week.

At dinner, the English average for serving meat, 6.4 times per week per household, was the highest and the Italian average of 4.2 and the Jewish average of 4.3 were the lowest. In addition to the English group, the French, German, Russian, and Scandinavian groups were all above the average of 5.6 times noted for the American white group.

Considerable variation was found in the number of times meat was served in the households of the middle and well-to-do classes of the American white group when the replies were arranged by cities. The replies from housewives in 16 cities are presented in Table 13. The replies seemed to indicate a tendency on the part of cities in the southeastern section of the country to serve meat more frequently for breakfast. The average for all cities was twice a week. In Baltimore the average was 3.4 times; in Birmingham, 4.6; Jacksonville, 3.6 times; Oklahoma City, 3.3 times and in Washington, 3.5 times.

Question 9.—Why do you serve meat in preference to other foods? (Table 14.)

This question was directed toward the determination of the reasons prompting the use of meat. The principal reason stated by the 2,183 housewives of the American white group who answered this question was related to the palatability, 51.1 per cent of the total number of housewives stating that they served it because they liked it in preference to other foods. In this same group of housewives, 29.5 per cent said that they served meat because of its food value. These two reasons included over 80 per cent of the replies. The remaining replies were distributed in order among the following reasons: Habit or custom, main dish of the meal, balanced meal, ease of preparation, variety, and protein content. It was recognized that the replies relative to the main dish of the meal, balanced meal, and protein content were closely related to the more general expression, "Food value."

No marked variation was found between the different classes within the American white group, as the distribution of replies was similar for the four classes.

In the colored group of housewives the relative number answering that they served meat because they liked it was materially larger than in the American white group. The replies indicative of food value were less in relation to total replies than was the case in the American white group, a larger portion of the colored housewives failing to recognize the food value of meat.

In the foreign groups there was exhibited a tendency away from answers implying palatability toward answers indicative of food value or habit and custom. The French and German groups particularly stressed the habit or custom of serving meat.

Question 10.—When you do not serve meat for dinner, what is your first choice of a food to take its place? (Tables 15 and 16.)

Fish was the food most frequently stated in answer to this question by housewives of the American white group. Of 2,469 housewives, 30.1 per cent gave this article of food as their first choice of a food when they did not serve meat at dinner. Vegetables were named by 21.1 per cent of the same group, while eggs were third in rank with a percentage of 20.2. The food next in importance was spaghetti, 7.6 per cent of the housewives stating that this was their first choice of a food to take the place of meat at dinner. Dairy products, poultry, soup, baked beans, cereals, bread, and salads were named by small percentages of the group.

A study of preferences by standard-of-living groups indicated rather important differences in the relative positions of various articles of food. Preference for fish became more pronounced in the American white group as the standard of living became better. Vegetables were more popular in the poor class as food when meat was not served. Eggs were more favored to take the place of meat in the homes of the middle and well-to-do classes than in either the poor or wealthy homes. Poultry was of greater importance as the standard of living became better.

In the colored group, the percentage of the total number of housewives who stated that fish was their first choice of a meat substitute at dinner, was materially greater in both the poor and middle classes than in the same classes of the American white group and even greater than the percentage of first choice in the well-to-do and wealthy classes of the latter group. The same to a slightly less extent was true of vegetables. The percentages indicative of the use of eggs show that this article of food was much less favored in the colored than in the American white group.

Among the more interesting differences noted between the American white group and the various foreign groups were those relating to the Italian and Jewish groups. Of the total number of Italian housewives replying to the question, 42 per cent stated that spaghetti was their first choice of a food to take the place of meat at dinner. An additional 10.6 per cent stated that soup was their first choice. In the Jewish group 14.2 per cent of the housewives stated that they used some of the dairy products in the place of meat. An additional 16 per cent of the Jewish group gave poultry as their first choice

Preferences for different foods varied widely among the 16 cities when comparison was made on the basis of the combined replies of the middle and well-to-do classes of housewives of the American white group for each city. (Table 16.)

The preference for fish was most marked in New Orleans, in Washington, and in Baltimore. The preference for fish was least marked in Lincoln, where not one housewife stated that her household preferred fish when meat was not served for dinner. In Birmingham only 9.2 per cent of the housewives said that fish was preferred in their households when meat was not served.

Question 11.—Why do you use other foods instead of meat? (Table 17.)

One and frequently two answers were given to this question. In compiling the results all answers have been combined. This procedure accounted for the 4,222 replies of the American white group, which was larger than the total of 2,912 questionnaires shown in Table 2. In answer to the question, 36.1 per cent of the 4,222 replies were variety, 22.1 per cent were palatability, 11.3 per cent related to food value, 10.8 per cent to health, 6.5 per cent to economy, 4.9 per cent to religious reasons, and the remaining 8.3 per cent of the replies were divided among the following reasons: Convenience of preparation, dislike of too much meat, balanced diet, custom and habit, and children's health.

Economy was the reason which showed the greatest variation with differences in class in the American white group. In the poor class, economy constituted 15.5 per cent of the total number of replies. In the middle class, the corresponding figure was 6.6 per cent. In the well-to-do class, it was 2.5 per cent, and in the wealthy class the reason was given by only 0.5 per cent of the total number of housewives replying.

In the foreign groups as in the American white group, the principal reasons assigned for the use of other foods instead of meat were variety and palatability. Religion and economy as reasons were more frequent among the foreign groups than in either the American white or colored groups. Price was indicated as an important factor in the choice of food in the Finnish, Polish, Italian, English, and German groups. Religious reasons were important in the Polish, Russian, Italian, German, and English groups, and health reasons in the Jewish group.

Question 12.—(*a*) Type of market patronized? (Tables 18 and 19.)

The individual or unit combination meat and grocery store was the type most frequently patronized by housewives of the American white group. Of the total number replying, more than half stated that they patronized this type of meat market. Next in order of importance were the individual or unit straight meat market, stalls in public markets, chain stores of the combination meat and grocery type, and chain stores of the straight meat-market type. The housewives patronizing wholesale markets, department store meat markets, farmers' markets, and cooperative or commissary markets were very small in number, when expressed as percentages of the total number of 2,692 housewives answering the question.

There was a rather pronounced tendency for housewives of the poor class to patronize the unit combination market, 57.2 per cent of housewives of this class replying that they did so, while 52.6 per cent of the middle class, 50.4 per cent of the well-to-do class, and 45.6 per cent of the wealthy class of housewives traded at the unit com-

bination type of market. Some tendency was noted for housewives of the wealthy class to patronize straight meat markets and stalls in public markets to a larger extent than housewives of the other groups.

In the colored group there was found a larger percentage of housewives who patronized stalls in public markets than was the case in the American white group. This was explainable by the fact that in at least two of the four cities from which the questionnaires from colored persons were secured, the public market was a very important factor in retail meat distribution. This situation was not general in all 16 cities where the American white questionnaires were secured, so so that the tendency toward the public market noted in the colored group may be properly attributed to the fact that public markets were more available to the colored group than to the American white group as a whole. (Table 19.)

In the foreign groups, the straight market was the type most often patronized. Eight of the 9 foreign groups—English, Finnish, French, German, Italian, Jewish, Russian, and Scandinavian—patronized the straight meat market to the largest extent. Characteristics of nationality, religion, and local meat distributing methods were all combined to produce the observed results. For example, local restrictions in the methods of distribution have resulted in the distribution of meat in New Orleans taking place largely through straight meat markets and public markets. The high percentages noted for the French group may be attributed to these factors, since the 49 housewives of this class interviewed were located in New Orleans. In the Jewish group religious custom was largely responsible for 77.4 per cent of the housewives stating that they traded at straight meat markets.

The extent to which the various types of markets were patronized by the middle and well-to-do classes of the American white group in the 16 cities is shown in Table 19. Over 50 per cent of the housewives of these classes in Birmingham, Denver, Grand Forks, Lincoln, New Haven, Oklahoma City, San Francisco, and Washington traded at the unit combination grocery and meat store. In Binghamton, Fargo, Jacksonville, and Minneapolis over 50 per cent of the housewives of these two classes purchased meat at unit straight meat markets. In Baltimore, New Orleans, and Washington the stalls in public markets were patronized to a considerable extent, while in Birmingham, Jacksonville, and Philadelphia the store of the combination meat and grocery chain was patronized by between 11 and 16 per cent of the housewives of the middle and well-to-do classes of the American white group.

Question 12.—(*b*) How many blocks is your meat dealer's store from you? (Table 20.)

This question was directed toward the determination of the extent to which housewives patronized stores at varying distances from their homes. The tendency to get out of the immediate neighborhood in which the household lives might well indicate the effort of searching out dealers. The near-by dealer has the advantage of location, but this factor from the standpoint of the consumer is not the most important in the choice of a meat shop.

A definite disposition to trade with the dealers near-by was indicated in the replies of the poor and middle classes in the American

white group, but in the well-to-do and wealthy classes a very large proportion of each group traveled six blocks and more to the meat markets which they patronized. These differences were more pronounced when the percentages indicative of replies were grouped on the basis of those trading at markets within a distance of two blocks or less and those patronizing markets at distance of six blocks and over. It was then found that 54.5 per cent of the housewives of the poor class of the American white group patronized a meat shop two blocks or less from where they lived. In the middle class, 47.8 per cent of the housewives, 30.4 per cent of the well-to-do class, and 10.6 per cent of the wealthy class traded at shops within two blocks of their homes. In the poor class 22.7 per cent of the housewives traded at markets six blocks and more distant, while 31.9 per cent of the middle class, 48.3 per cent of the well-to-do class, and 69.1 per cent of the wealthy class traveled similar distances.

At least three factors contributed to the results noted: (1) The use of the automobile by the well-to-do classes made easier the traveling of greater distances to markets, (2) the occurrence of markets in the residential areas in which the well-to-do and wealthy classes lived was not so general as in the poorer areas of the cities, as in these better residential areas there is observed a tendency toward a greater restriction of markets to relatively limited business areas, and (3) the employment of delivery services of dealers.

In the colored group, 62.5 per cent of the housewives of the poor class stated that they patronized meat markets within a two-block distance of their homes, but in the middle class only 46.3 per cent of the housewives went a similar distance. It was also found that 33.1 per cent of the middle class went distances of six blocks and over which was in close agreement with the similar percentage of 31.9 per cent for the middle-class groups of the American white class.

The housewives of the foreign groups for the most part traded at stores within two blocks of their homes. The exceptions were the French and Scandinavian groups.

Question 12.—(*c*) How many meat dealers are nearer than your dealer's shop? (Table 21.)

The replies to this question indicated that while housewives did not always trade at the meat market nearest their homes, yet very definite tendencies to do so were exhibited in most groups.

In the American white group, nearly one-half of the housewives of the poor class replying to the question patronized the nearest dealer. More than one-third of the housewives of the middle and well-to-do classes, and about one-fourth of the housewives of the wealthy group traded at the market closest at hand. The tendency on the part of the well-to-do and wealthy classes to trade at markets at some distance from their homes was again indicated by the larger numbers of the housewives of these groups who passed five or more markets in going to their dealers' markets.

In the colored and foreign groups, 50 per cent and over of the housewives stated that they did not pass more than one meat market in going to their dealers' shops, the one exception being the Scandinavian group in which the percentage of housewives passing not more than one shop was 49.6 per cent.

Question 12.—(*d*) Does your meat dealer extend a charge service?
(*e*) Do you ordinarily have your meat charged? (Table 22.)

In compiling the replies to these questions only those questionnaires on which both questions were answered were used. Comparison was thus made possible between both questions for the same group of housewives.

In the American white group, 66 per cent of the 374 housewives of the poor class stated that they traded at shops where credit was granted to customers, but only 29.4 per cent of the group had their purchases charged. Of the 383 housewives of the middle class, 66.3 per cent stated that their meat dealers extended credit service, but only 27.7 per cent of the group had their meat charged. In the well-to-do class, 74.8 per cent of the 413 housewives said that their dealers offered credit service, and 54.5 per cent of the group availed themselves of this service. In the wealthy group, 84.5 per cent of the 440 housewives stated that their dealers extended credit, and 73.4 per cent of the group had their meat charged.

Credit was not so commonly offered in the markets patronized by the colored group, according to the replies of the 238 housewives of this group. In the poor class, 41.2 per cent of the housewives traded at stores where credit was offered and 15.1 per cent had their meat charged. The results in the middle class were similar, 48.7 per cent of the replies indicating that trading was done at stores extending credit, and only 21 per cent of the housewives having meat charged.

In the foreign group, 61.5 per cent of the English housewives traded at credit stores and 23.1 per cent charged their purchases. About 83.3 per cent of the French patronized the credit store and 63.3 per cent had meat charged ordinarily, 86.4 per cent of the German group went to credit stores but only 33.9 per cent had an account, 76.4 per cent of the Italian group traded at stores where credit was offered and 45.5 per cent availed themselves of this service, 97.8 per cent of the Russians traded at credit stores and 65.2 per cent had a charge account, and 70.6 per cent of the Scandinavian group purchased meat at credit stores but only 23.5 per cent had their purchases charged.

The results of this question are not to be taken as indicative of the preferences of the various groups for credit or for cash stores. Neither are the extents to which various groups availed themselves of credit service to be taken as measures of their desires for the service. The desirability of certain groups or portions of groups as credit risks varies greatly, and it is this factor which was probably of greatest influence in bringing about the differences noted among the groups in the use of credit service.

Question 12.—(*f*) What quality of meat does your dealer handle? (Table 23.)

In the American white group, 1,748 housewives living in 10 cities answered this question. Their answers were found to be grouped in six major classes. These answers and the percentage of the total number of housewives whose answers fell in each each class were: Best, 34.6 per cent; very good, 13.9 per cent; good, 43.1 per cent; fair, 7.3 per cent; ordinary, 0.9 per cent; and poor, 0.2 per cent. It was observed that housewives' knowledge of grades of meat was usually very slight. This conclusion was based on a comparison of the percentages indicative of the replies of the housewives with the

percentage composition by grades of the beef animals received on the Chicago market during the year 1924. Grading of these animals according to United States grades indicated that the proportions in which the various grades occurred were about as follows:

	Per cent
Prime	0. 5
Choice	8. 5
Good	23. 0
Medium	46. 0
Common	18. 5
Cutter and canner	3. 5
	100. 0

Direct comparison of these grades with the qualities indicated by the housewives was not possible, because of the lack of knowledge of grades on the part of the housewives; but there was some basis of comparison. Of the housewives of the American white group, 48.5 per cent answered that their dealers carried best and very good qualities of meat. If the Chicago receipts may be regarded as fairly typical of the animals marketed through the country, this housewife opinion was manifestly wrong, since the two highest grades, prime and choice, together constituted only 9 per cent of the total Chicago receipts.

Lack of knowledge of quality in meat was further demonstrated by housewives of the colored and foreign groups in much the same manner as that shown by the American white group.

The necessity for standard grades of meat and for sale by grade was apparent from the results of this question. Means should be at hand whereby housewives may learn to buy meat by grade and to know whether they are receiving the grade for which they have asked.

Question 12.—(*g*) How long have you bought meat from your present dealer? (Tables 24 and 25.)

The tendency of the well-to-do and wealthy classes of the American white group to trade a greater length of time with one dealer was brought out by the replies to this question. In the poor class, 19.4 per cent of the housewives answering the question stated that they had traded with their present dealers over 5 years (5 to 10 years and over 10 years percentages combined). Similar figures for the middle, well-to-do, and wealthy classes were 19.8, 23.0, and 35.3. When the percentages for the various periods two years and under were combined, it was found that 57.6 per cent of the poor-class housewives had traded with their present dealers for two years or less. Fifty-six per cent of the housewives of the middle class, 46.1 per cent of those of the well-to-do class, and 32 per cent of the wealthy-class housewives stated that they had traded with their meat dealers for a period not to exceed two years.

In the colored group, 51.6 per cent of the housewives of the poor class and 47.8 per cent of the housewives of the middle class replied that they had not traded with their present dealers over two years.

In the foreign groups the percentages of the total number of housewives in each group replying that they had traded with their dealers two years or less were as follows: English, 45.4 per cent; Finnish, 27.9 per cent; French, 38 per cent; German, 32.1 per cent; Italian, 42.2 per cent; Jewish, 54 per cent; Polish, 38.8 per cent; Russian, 55.1 per cent; Scandinavian, 49.3 per cent. The foreign groups in

which the tendency to trade with meat dealers over five years was most pronounced were the Finnish group in which 37.2 per cent of the housewives replied that this was the case, the French group with a percentage of 30, the German group with 44.1 per cent, and the Polish with 30.6 per cent.

The combined replies by cities of the middle and well-to-do classes of the American white group indicated that approximately 40 per cent of the housewives in Birmingham, Grand Forks, Jacksonville, and New Orleans had traded with their present meat dealers 12 months or less. (Table 25.) About 40 per cent of the housewives of the same group and classes in Baltimore and Binghamton had bought meat from the same dealers for over five years.

Question 12.—(*h*) Why do you buy from your meat dealer in preference to others? (Table 26.)

Of special interest to retailers are the factors which influence customers to trade with them. Forty-four and two-tenths per cent of the 2,709 housewives of the American white group stressed the fact that preference for the quality of meat handled by their dealers was the principal reason for trading with them, while 25.5 per cent stated that convenience of location was a reason of first importance in their choosing to trade with their present dealers. These two factors alone included almost 70 per cent of the total number of replies.

Housewives of the poor class emphasized convenience of location and economical prices to greater extent than was found in the other three classes of this group. Both of these factors lost importance as the standard of living of the groups increased. Housewives of the wealthy class emphasized quality of meat and good service more than the housewives of the other three classes. The increases in the demand for quality of meat and for more satisfactory service with improved standards of living were also evident.

In the colored group, housewives of both the poor and the middle classes stressed convenience of location and economical prices to a greater extent than was found in the replies of the housewives of the same classes in the American white group. Quality was also of importance, but not to the extent present in the poor and middle classes of the American white group.

In the foreign groups, English, Finnish, German, and Jewish housewives placed particular emphasis on the quality of meat handled as the reason for trading with their present dealers. Convenience of location was of importance to Finnish, French, German, Italian, Polish, Russian, and Scandinavian housewives. Economical prices were pointed out as the most important reason for trading with their present dealers by 15 per cent of the Polish housewives. Good service seemed to appeal particularly to the English, Italian, and Jewish housewives. Business and social connections were of most importance in the French and Russian groups of housewives. Habit or custom was the strongest among the Jewish housewives in determining choice of meat dealers.

Question 12.—(*i*) Have you ever stopped trading with a meat dealer because of dissatisfaction?
(*j*) If so, what was the reason? (Table 27.)

Of the housewives in the American white group, 74 per cent stated that they had never stopped trading with a meat dealer because of

dissatisfaction. Similar percentages with minor variations were found in the colored and foreign groups.

In those cases in the American white group where it was stated that trading had been stopped because of dissatisfaction, more than half the housewives replied that they had stopped patronizing the markets because of poor quality of meats.

In the poor class of the American white group, two-thirds of the housewives gave poor quality of meats as the principal reason for dissatisfaction. This reason was not quite so frequently stated by the housewives of the other classes.

Dishonesty as a reason for stopping trade with a meat dealer was the reason given by more of the housewives, of the well-to-do and wealthy classes than of the other two classes.

High prices were given as a reason for transfer of patronage because of dissatisfaction somewhat more frequently by the housewives of the poor class, although the difference in the other classes was so slight as to be of small importance.

Poor service was definitely indicated as a reason for discontinuance of trading with a meat dealer by 15.1 per cent of the wealthy class housewives who stated that they had stopped trading with a dealer because of dissatisfaction. This was almost two and one-half times the importance assigned to this reason by the housewives of any of the other three classes.

Housewives of the well-to-do class were first in their statements that they stopped trading with meat dealers because of insanitary shops.

In the colored group, quality and prices were the main reasons stated by housewives for changing meat dealers because of dissatisfaction.

In the foreign groups, the numbers replying that they had stopped trading with dealers because of dissatisfaction were so small, that the percentage distributions of these replies by reasons may not have been representative. Accordingly no great emphasis should be placed on the differences observed.

The importance of quality in meats was indicated by the results in Tables 26 and 27. In the first table the predominating reason for trading with present dealers in preference to others was that the quality of meat was satisfactory. The quality factor was again stressed in Table 27 where the replies showed that poor quality of meat was the principal reason assigned by housewives for discontinuance of trading with dealers because of dissatisfaction.

The reasons stated by housewives in answer to the question of dissatisfaction should be of particular interest to retailers of meat. Poor quality of meat, dishonesty, poor service, insanitary shop conditions, and variety of stock are the responsibilities of the dealer. Avoidance of personal differences with customers lies very largely within the power of the retailer, and to some extent the question of high prices may be satisfactorily met by efficient operation of the shop and by educational efforts designed to acquaint customers with the various qualities of meats and the general levels of meat prices.

Question 12.—(*k*) Why did you stop buying from your last meat dealer? (Table 28.)

A total of 1,650 housewives of the American white group answered this question, which was the final one of four directed toward deter-

mining the factors which draw trade to certain meat dealers, in preference to other dealers. Sixty-nine and four-tenths per cent of the replies stated that these housewives had stopped trading with their last meat dealers because the families had moved away from the area served by these dealers, or that the dealers had closed their businesses. These two reasons were classed as unavoidable causes for transfer of patronage. The remaining 30.6 per cent of the replies were divided among a number of reasons: Poor quality meats, shop inconveniently located for the customer, high prices, poor service, business connections, opening of a new shop which seemed to offer such advantages as quality of meat or convenience of location, insanitary shop, no credit service, and new dealer recommended.

In general, the replies made by the housewives of the American white group to the question of why they had stopped trading with dealers because of dissatisfaction and those received to the question of why trading with the last dealer was discontinued agreed in so far as the order of importance was concerned, although the relative importances among them were changed in degree. Poor quality, high prices, poor service, and insanitary shop conditions occurred in the same order in the answers to both of these questions. Limiting the question to reasons for discontinuance of trading with the last dealer eliminated the element of choice present in the previous question, where a statement of the reason for ceasing to patronize a dealer because of dissatisfaction was desired. This difference in all probability accounted for the introduction of several reasons which would not ordinarily be regarded as arising from dissatisfaction: Inconvenience of location, business connections, new shop, no credit service and the recommendation of a new dealer by friends. This last reason would appear to have an element of dissatisfaction in it since the housewife was in the proper frame of mind to make a change to the new dealer.

Question 13.—(*a*) Where have you seen fresh meat advertised by local stores? (Tables 29 and 30.)

A total number of 1,143 housewives of the American white group replied to this question. Of this number, 73.1 per cent mentioned posters in meat shops, 20 per cent remembered newspapers, 6.1 per cent recalled handbills and circulars, and 0.8 per cent thought of advertising in street-car posters and motion-picture shows. But little variation was noted in the replies of the different classes. Any variations observed were so slight that the differences were of no practical significance.

In the colored group the principal variations from the replies of the American white group of housewives were found in the recollection of handbills and circulars. Posters in shops were not so generally recalled by the housewives of the colored group as they were by the housewives of the poor and middle classes of the American white group.

In the foreign groups the number of replies was small, so that little importance can be attached to the results, with the exception of the Scandinavian group in which 81.7 per cent of the 82 housewives recalled posters in shops; 11 per cent, newspapers; and 7.3 per cent, handbills and circulars.

Differences among cities were found according to the results set forth in Table 30. When judged from the standpoint of frequency

of recollection by housewives, posters in shops were the most prominent method of local meat advertising in Birmingham, Fargo, Grand Forks, Lincoln, New Orleans, and Oklahoma City. Newspapers were remembered most often in Denver, Minneapolis, Oklahoma City, San Francisco, and Washington. Handbills and circulars were remembered to the greatest extent in Denver, Minneapolis, and Washington.

Question 13.—(*b*) What do you remember about meat advertising by local stores? (Table 31.)

In the American white group, 836 housewives answered this question. Reasonable prices were remembered by 47.4 per cent of the housewives, special prices by 25.2 per cent, listing of prices without any recollection as to whether they were reasonable or otherwise by 16 per cent, quality by 4.7 per cent, attractive meat displays within the store by 2.4 per cent, cheap cuts and prices by 1.9 per cent, charts of various cuts of meat by 1.9 per cent, and the handling of government inspected meat by 0.5 per cent. The price element was the predominant feature in 90.5 per cent of the advertising recalled by this group of housewives. Quality and other good-will advertising were recalled by relatively few housewives.

All of the advertising recalled by the poor class of the colored group pertained to price. With the exception of minor numbers this was also true of the middle class of this same group.

In the foreign groups this same strong tendency toward recollection of price advertising was apparent. The persons in the foreign groups replying to this question were few in number, so that the results presented were probably of slight importance as indications of the tendencies of the various nationality groups, with the possible exception of the Scandinavian group in which 48.2 per cent of the 56 housewives recalled reasonable price advertising; 33.9 per cent, special price; 8.9 per cent, list of prices.

It was plainly apparent from the replies to this question that the price appeal was the one thing in meat advertising which was most persistent in the minds of the housewives. This tendency was due to one of two reasons: (1) The meat-advertising policies of local stores were almost entirely directed along the line of price appeal, or (2) the dominant influence in the housewife's purchasing of meat was price. That the latter was not the case has been amply demonstrated by the previous discussion of questions in which the price appeal was found to be of less importance than the quality appeal. It is also a matter of almost common knowledge that advertising by meat markets is directed largely along price lines with but little attention to quality and good-will advertising which will draw trade through other means than that of price.

Question 14.—If you owned a market, what would you advertise about your meat? (Tables 32 and 33.)

In an effort to determine the factors which the housewife regarded as of most importance in advertising, there was included a question in answer to which the housewife was asked to state her ideas of what she would advertise if she were the owner of a meat market.

It was important to find that the advertising factors which housewives stressed were evidently those to which retailers of meat had given but little attention. The type of advertising which appealed

to the housewives was institutional in character, and was directed toward the development of good will for the market. Quality and sanitary handling of meats were the two factors which were indicated most strongly, 53.7 per cent of the 1,615 housewives of the American white group naming quality and 27.3 per cent of the same group mentioning sanitary handling, while only 8.3 per cent indicated economical prices. Other factors were named by small numbers: Government inspected meats, 4.5 per cent; food value, 1.7 per cent; variety of choice, 1.6 per cent; good service, 1.3 per cent; reliability, 1.2 per cent; special prices, 0.4 per cent.

But little variation was found in the extent to which housewives of each of the four classes of the American white group would stress quality in their advertising if they were the owners of meat shops, approximately 50 per cent of the replies in each class being quality. Variations in standard of living and the differences arising therefrom were evident in some of the answers to this question. Only 17.1 per cent of the housewives of the poor class would stress sanitary handling, while 26.1 per cent of those of the middle class, 31.4 per cent of those of the well-to-do class, and 33.1 per cent of those of the wealthy class thought this phase of retailing should be given first importance in advertising.

The effect of variation in income was observed in the differences in the relative numbers replying that they would emphasize economical prices. Housewives of the poor class of the American white group led in the number indicating this factor, 15.1 per cent of the class stating this answer, the middle class housewives were second with 13.9 per cent, while 2.6 per cent of the housewives of the well-to-do and 2.4 per cent of those of the wealthy class would emphasize economy of price.

In the classes of the colored group the principal advertising appeals were those of quality and sanitary handling.

Housewives of the Finnish, French, and Italian groups would stress quality much more than the housewives of other groups, over 70 per cent of the replies in the three groups indicating quality.

Some variations were found in the points which would be emphasized by the housewives of different cities. (Table 33.) Housewives of Fargo and New Orleans would stress economical prices more than the housewives of eight other cities. The housewives of San Francisco would stress Government-inspected meats. With the exception of a few instances noted, the housewives of the 10 cities were in close ageement on the factors which they would advertise.

The answers of the housewives to this question would appear to be of special significance. Meat, in so far as the housewife is aware of it, is an unbranded and ungraded product. The knowledge of meat grades possessed by the housewives reached by this survey was found to be slight and inadequate for the intelligent purchasing of meat by grade. The nature of the product and the lack of knowledge of quality and grades on the part of the housewives have resulted in reliance to a large degree on the integrity and dependability of the meat dealer. It is his proficiency in choosing the grades of meat adaptable to the needs of his trade on which most customers rely. Purchasers desire the highest quality of meats consistent with the prices which they are able to pay, and when they believe that quality has not been maintained or that prices and quality are not in proper relation to one

another, the dealer loses customers. Under this system of distribution the meat dealer should find it advisable to develop confidence in his reliability and in his knowledge of the meat business. It was thus not surprising to find that housewives were interested in advertising which would build up good will for the dealer. Creation of good will and efforts "to sell the store itself" to the housewife by building on a foundation of well-directed institutional advertising should be of the greatest value to the meat dealer who wishes his business to show progress.

Question 15.—How do you purchase meat? (Tables 34 and 35.)

According to the housewives of the American white group who answered this question, the housewife usually purchased the meat for the household, more than half of the number stating that they did so personally. An additional one-fourth of the number purchased by telephone order. In 9 per cent of the households the husband did the meat buying, in 4.5 per cent of the homes the children were sent to the store to buy meat, in 1.1 per cent the servants bought the supply of meat.

The use of these methods of purchase varied with the classes. In the American white group, the range for personal purchase of the meat used in their households was between 68.8 per cent for the poor and 37.1 per cent for the wealthy-class housewives. An even greater variation was shown in the replies relating to the use of the telephone by the housewife in purchasing meat. The class making the least use of the telephone was the poor class, in which 4.4 per cent of the housewives replying to the question stated that they used this method. Sixteen per cent of the housewives of the middle-class group, 34.1 per cent of those of the well-to-do class, and 52.7 per cent of those of the wealthy class used the telephone in purchasing meat.

Conditions were somewhat the reverse in the matter of meat purchasing by the husband or by the children of the family. The wealthy class was the only one of the classes of the American white group which purchased meat to any extent through servants.

In the colored group the percentage of housewives personally buying meat was a little larger than in the American white group, being over 70 per cent in both classes of the group. Use of the telephone was almost negligible by both classes, only 1 per cent of the housewives purchasing by this method. It was somewhat more usual for the husbands to purchase meat in the colored classes than in the poor and middle classes of the American white group.

In the foreign group also the relative number of housewives who purchased meat personally was higher than that indicated for the American white group. In the English, Finnish, German, Italian, Jewish, and Polish groups, 70 per cent or more of the housewives of each of these groups stated that they purchased meat personally. Use of the telephone was especially important among the French, Russian, and Scandinavian groups. Meat buying was done by husbands in 11.7 per cent of the households of the Italian group and in 22.8 per cent of those of the Scandinavian group. In the German and Russian groups, children were sent to purchase meat more frequently than in any other of the foreign groups, the colored, or the American white classes. Twelve per cent of the French housewives

replied that other adults in the family did the meat purchasing or that meat dealers solicited in person.

Variations between cities in the extent to which the different methods of purchasing were employed were of interest, although explanation of the reasons for these variations was not at hand. (Table 35.) In Baltimore, Birmingham, Denver, Jacksonville, Lincoln, Minneapolis, New Haven, Oklahoma City, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, and Washington over half of the housewives of the combined middle and well-to-do classes of the American white group stated that they personally purchased meat for family use. The use of the telephone was relatively highest in Fargo, Grand Forks, and New Orleans, where approximately 40 per cent of the housewives stated that they used this method of purchasing meat. Baltimore, Pittsburgh, and Washington housewives made the least use of the telephone, less than 15 per cent of the housewives of the two groups from these three cities stating that they ordered meat by telephone.

In Binghamton, Birmingham, Denver, Fargo, Grand Forks, and Lincoln the percentages of the total numbers of housewives replying that the meat for the family was customarily purchased by the husband varied from 13.4 per cent for Denver to 21.3 per cent for Binghamton. The remaining cities showed relatively low percentages in comparison with those of the six cities.

Question 16.—(*a*) When you purchase meat, is your mind made up to buy beef, pork, etc., before you go to the store? (Tables 36 and 37.)

In answer to this question, nearly three-fourths of the housewives of the American white group replied that they had their minds made up regarding the kind of meat they wished to purchase before going to the store.

There was a slightly greater tendency for the housewives of the poor and middle classes of the American white group to state that they either had their minds only partly made up or did not know the kind of meat they desired before they went to the store than was the case in the well to do and wealthy classes.

The housewives of both classes in the colored group indicated by their answers that they were not so inclined to decide the kind of meat to be purchased before going to the store as the housewives of the poor and middle classes of the American white group.

The tendency to wait to decide on the kind of meat to be purchased until reaching the market was apparent to a considerable extent in some of the foreign groups. About 22.2 per cent of the Finnish housewives, 26 per cent of the French housewives, 31.6 per cent of the Italian housewives, and 31.2 per cent of the Jewish housewives stated that they did not decide upon the kind of meat they were going to buy until they had reached the store. The answers of the housewives of the remaining foreign groups were distributed similarly to those of the American white group.

According to the replies of the housewives of the middle and well-to-do classes of the American white group in the 16 cities, an average of nearly 70 per cent of the group had their minds made up in regard to the kind of meat which they wished to purchase, before they went to the store. (Table 37.)

Variations between cities were somewhat marked, as 90.9 per cent of the Washington housewives in the two classes and 85.9 per cent

of those in Fargo stated that they made up their minds before they went to the store, while in Pittsburgh only 54.3 per cent of the housewives said that they had made up their minds regarding the kind of meat they wished to purchase before they went to market.

Question 16.—(*b*) When you purchase meat, is your mind made up to buy boiling meat, roast, fry, etc., before you go to the store? (Tables 38 and 39.)

This question though not intended as a check on the replies to 16 (*a*) might very well serve as such. The distribution of the replies of the various groups and classes agree very well with the answers received to the previous question. This was to be expected, since the housewife who had made up her mind to buy beef in all probability had also gone so far as to decide on the particular cut she was to buy.

Of the 2,869 housewives replying to this question, 75 per cent stated that when they purchased meat their minds were made up regarding the cut that they wished to buy before they went to the store. Housewives answering that their minds were only partly made up constituted 12.9 per cent of the total and those answering "No" were 12.1 per cent of the group. There was a tendency for the relative number of those stating that they had made up their minds before going to the store to increase as the standard of living of the groups became better.

In the colored group there was a shift in the proportionate number of replies indicating that decision had been only partly or not at all made before the housewife went to market. These two replies totaled over 40 per cent in each of the classes of the colored group and slightly less than 30 per cent in the American white group.

In the foreign groups, the percentage of the housewives in each group replying that they had made up their minds as to the kind of meat they wished to purchase before they went to the store was similiar to the 75 per cent average for the American white group, with the exceptions of the French, Italian, and Jewish groups, in which the corresponding percentages were 56, 49.3, and 38.5.

Some variations were found between the cities when comparisons were made on the basis of the combined replies of the middle and well-to-do classes. (Table 39.) It was found that the percentage in Washington was 93, in Jacksonville 85.8 per cent, in Fargo 83.6 per cent, and in Birmingham 82 per cent, all of which were materially greater than the average for the 16 cities. The New Orleans group of housewives indicated the lowest percentage of these cities, as only 59 per cent of the housewives stated that they had made up their minds in regard to the kind of meat to be purchased before they went to the store.

Question 16.—(*c*) When you purchase meat, do you buy at specially advertised prices? (Tables 40 and 41.)

More than three-fourths of the housewives of the American white group who replied to this question stated that they never bought meat at specially advertised prices, but there was about an 18 per cent difference between the percentage of the housewives of the American poor class replying "Never" to the question and the percentage of the wealthy class housewives who stated that they did not buy at specially advertised prices.

The answers of the housewives of the colored class did not differ materially from those received from the poor and middle classes of the American white group.

In the foreign group some variations of seeming importance were found. Ranging from 100 per cent of the French, 80 per cent of the Russian, 75.6 per cent of the Finnish, 73.2 per cent of the Jewish, 71.7 per cent of the Italian, 67.4 per cent of the German, 63.4 per cent of the Polish, 63.2 per cent of the English, to 59.3 per cent of the Scandinavian housewives, replies stated that such housewives of this group never bought meat at specially advertised prices. About 11.6 per cent of the housewives of the English group, 15.4 per cent of the Italian, and 16.9 per cent of the Polish housewives stated that they often bought meat at specially advertised prices.

When the middle class and well-to-do class replies of American white housewives were combined and arranged by cities, it was found that over 30 per cent of the housewives in Fargo, Grand Forks, Lincoln, Oklahoma City, and Philadelphia stated that they bought meat at special prices occasionally. In New Haven, New Orleans, San Francisco, and Washington the tendency to purchase at special prices was slight, the percentage of the housewives stating that they bought meat either occasionally or often at special prices not exceeding 6.1 per cent of the replies from each of these cities. Other variations between cities were found in accordance with the results shown in Table 41.

Question 16.—(*d*) When you purchase meat, are you influenced by meat displays? (Tables 42 and 43.)

The attention given the proper display of meat in some of the more efficiently operated markets was justified, when the answers to this question were considered, as 33.5 per cent of 2,869 housewives of the American white group stated "Yes," and 17.1 per cent stated "Partly." In all the groups the relative numbers of housewives replying that they were influenced by meat displays in their meat purchases were large.

In the American white group, 57.6 per cent of the housewives of the poor class and 52.7 per cent of those of the middle class stated that they were influenced in their meat purchasing by the store display. The influence of meat displays was admitted by 67.8 per cent of the poor class and 64 per cent of the middle class housewives of the colored group, by 73.3 per cent of the housewives of the Finnish group, by 52 per cent of those in the French group, by 63.6 per cent of those in the Italian group, by 52 per cent of those in the Russian group, and by 58.7 per cent of those in the Scandinavian group.

The replies of the middle-class and well-to-do class housewives of the American white group for 16 cities are presented in Table 43. In 9 of these cities over 50 per cent of the housewives of these two classes stated that they were influenced by meat displays in their purchasing of meat.

Housewives in Jacksonville and Washington indicated by their replies that they were least influenced by meat displays, only 21.2 per cent of the housewives of the combined middle and well-to-do classes in Jacksonville and 24.5 per cent of those of the same classes in Washington stated either "Yes" or "Partly" in answer to the question.

Question 16.—(*e*) When you purchase meat, are you influenced by salesmen? (Tables 44 and 45.)

A total of 2,870 housewives of the American white group answered the question of whether in purchasing meat they were influenced by salesmen. Of this number, 73.8 per cent stated that they were not influenced, 16.3 per cent that they were, and 9.9 per cent that they were influenced sometimes.

The replies of the housewives of Fargo, New Orleans, and Washington indicated that they believed they were influenced by salesmen to greater extent in purchasing of meat than were the housewives of the remaining 13 cities, 57.6 per cent of the housewives of Fargo, 39 per cent of those in New Orleans, and 35.7 per cent of the Washington housewives of the middle and well-to-do classes stating "Yes" or "Sometimes" in answer to the question. (Table 45.)

Question 16.—(*f*) When you purchase meat, are you influenced by price? (Tables 46 and 47.)

The influence of price in the purchasing of meat by consumers is an important one to producers and distributors. Housewives' estimates of the extent to which they were influenced by price in the purchasing of meat were obtained through this question. Over half of the number in the American white group who answered the question stated that they were not influenced by price in purchasing of meat, 26.3 per cent of the number said they were influenced by price, while 16.5 per cent answered that they were only partly influenced. Thus 42.8 per cent of the group replied that they were influenced to various extents by price in their meat purchasing.

Rather important variations were noted in the replies of the housewives of the four classes in the American white group, as 40.7 per cent of the housewives of the poor class, 53.4 per cent of those of the middle class, 61.9 per cent of those of the well-to-do class, and 77.3 per cent of those of the wealthy class said that they were not influenced by price. Stated in another way the replies indicated that of the total number of housewives in the poor, middle, well-to-do, and wealthy classes, 59.3, 46.6, 38.1, and 22.7 per cent, respectively, said that they were influenced by price.

In the colored group the relative numbers of housewives influenced and not influenced by price in both the middle and poor classes did not vary much from those of the housewives of these two classes in the American white group.

In order of rank as indicated by the percentage of the total number of housewives stating that price had an influence in their purchasing of meat, the nine foreign groups were arrayed as follows: Scandinavian, English, Italian, German, Russian, Finnish, Polish, Jewish, and French.

Rather wide variations were found when the answers to this question were grouped by cities. (Table 47.) Fargo was the city in which there was the largest percentage of housewives of the combined middle and well-to-do classes who stated that they were entirely or only partly influenced by price in their meat purchasing, 68.5 per cent of the housewives of this city answering either "Yes" or "Partly" to the question. The city with the lowest corresponding percentage was New Orleans, with a percentage of 29. There

was thus indicated a range between these two percentages of almost 40 per cent.

The rank of the 16 cities in order of the percentage of housewives replying that they were influenced by price was as follows: Fargo, Grand Forks, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Washington, Lincoln, Binghamton, Oklahoma City, Denver, Minneapolis, Birmingham, Baltimore, San Francisco, New Haven, Jacksonville, and New Orleans.

Question 16.—(*g*) When you purchase meat, do you shop between stores? (Tables 48 and 49.)

A total of 2,860 housewives of the American white group replied to this question. Of this number, 56.9 per cent stated that they never shopped between stores in purchasing meat, 31.2 per cent said that they shopped between stores sometimes and 11.9 per cent said that they shopped much between stores in buying meat.

The poor, middle, and well-to-do classes of this group showed little variation in the distribution of their answers to this question among the three classifications,—"None," "Some," and "Much." In the wealthy group, however, the percentage of total replies indicative of no shopping among stores in the purchasing of meat was 70.6, which was materially larger than the 51.4 per cent of the poor class, the 51.3 per cent of the middle class, and the 57.3 per cent of the well-to-do class.

In the colored group the relative numbers of housewives who shopped between stores were larger in both the poor and middle classes than in the same classes of the American white group.

When the foreign groups were arranged in order, the variation of the relative numbers of housewives replying that they did some or much shopping between stores in purchasing meat, the order was: Italian, English, Polish, Jewish, German, Scandinavan, Russian, Finnish, and French.

In Table 49,the variations among the cities were rather wide, the percentage of the total number of housewives replying that they did not shop among stores ranging from 84.7 in Washington to 37.9 in Pittsburgh. The order of the cities was as follows: Washington, Grand Forks, Jacksonville, New Haven, Baltimore, Binghamton, San Francisco, New Orleans, Philadelphia, Fargo, Minneapolis, Denver, Oklahoma City, Lincoln, Birmingham, and Pittsburgh.

Question 16.—(*h*) When you purchase meat, do you buy by pound or portion? (Tables 50 and 51.)

A total of 566 housewives of the poor, middle, and well-to-do classes of the American white group in Baltimore, Binghamton, Jacksonville, and New Haven replied to this question. Of these housewives, 83 per cent stated that they purchased by the pound and the remaining 17 per cent said that they bought meat by the portion. As here used "portion" implies the designation of a quantity by means other than weight, that is, a cut of steak, or a two-rib roast, as distinguished from requests for definite quantities of the same cuts by weight. The differences among the classes seemed to be of importance, 92.3 per cent of the housewives of the poor class, 83.7 per cent of the middle class, 73.9 per cent of the well-to-do, saying that they purchased by the pound.

The same method of purchase was used to a large extent by the housewives of the poor and middle classes of the colored group.

In the foreign groups, 91.9 per cent of the Italian housewives saip that they purchased meat by the pound. A slightly larger percentage, 94.8, of the Polish housewives bought meat by the pound rather than by the portion.

Differences among the cities were slight and probably of relatively slight importance. When the replies of housewives of the middle and well-to-do classes of the American white group were combined for four cities, it was found that the lowest percentage reporting that they purchased by the pound, 70.5, was in Binghamton. In Jacksonville, 84.8 per cent of the housewives stated that they bought by the pound. Between these extremes were the percentages of Baltimore and New Haven. (Table 51.)

Question 17.—Name the kinds of beef steaks and beef roasts you can recognize, if cut. (Table 52.)

In getting answers to this question interviewers were instructed to ask the housewife to name the various kinds of beef steaks and beef roasts which she could recognize if they were cut and separated from the carcass.

In the American white group, 2,787 housewives answered the part of the question relating to steaks. The average number of steaks recognized was 3.1. There was a definite tendency for the average number recognized to increase with the increase in the standard of living. The average numbers of steaks recognized by the housewives of the poor, middle, well-to-do and wealthy classes were 2.4, 3, 3.5, and 3.4, respectively.

The average number of steaks recognized by the housewives of the poor and middle classes of the colored group was somewhat smaller than the number of those recognized by the housewives of the same classes in the American white group.

In the English, Finnish, French, and German groups the average number of steaks recognized was relatively high. In the remaining five groups the average number of steaks recognized was rather low.

Somewhat similar results were obtained from the tabulation of the answer to the part of the question relating to the number of beef roasts recognized by the housewife. For the 2,618 housewives of the American white group replying to the question, the average was 2.3. Knowledge of roasts was highest in the wealthy group and lowest in the poor class. The average numbers recognized by the housewives of each of the four classes were: Poor, 1.5; middle, 2.1; well-to-do, 2.5; and wealthy, 3.3.

The average number of roasts recognized by the housewives of the two colored classes was lower for both than the averages of the poor and middle classes of the American white group.

The English group of housewives, which was first in the number of steaks recognized, was also first in the number of roasts recognized, and the German group, which was second in the average number of steaks recognized, was also second in the number of roasts recognized. The Scandinavian group, however, which was fifth in the average number of steaks recognized, was third in the number of roasts recog-

nized, and the French group, which was third in the average number of steaks recognized, was fifth in the number of roasts recognized. The remaining foreign groups followed essentially the same order in recognition of roasts as they presented in the knowledge of steaks.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The principal results of the study of meat consumer preferences and habits are summarized under four groupings: (1) Meat consumption, (2) meat purchasing, (3) meat advertising, and (4) consumer knowledge of meat quality and cuts. In this summary are presented only the more outstanding results of the analysis of replies from 4,466 housewives representing meat-eating households whose members numbered 20,744 persons in 16 representative cities of the United States.

MEAT CONSUMPTION

1. In the American white group, over 5 per cent of the total number of persons did not eat meat. Almost 2 per cent of the men and over 3 per cent of the women did not eat meat. There was noted a tendency for more men and fewer women to eat meat as the standard of living of the households became higher. In the colored and foreign groups the relative numbers of persons not eating meat were less than in the American white group.

2. Health and diet reasons were stated by almost three-fourths of the adults of the American white group who said that they did not eat meat.

3. Four-fifths or over of the housewives believed that their families were eating a proper amount of meat.

4. Beef was the preferred meat in two-thirds of the households of the American white group. Pork, lamb, and veal were preferred in the order named. Preference for pork decreased and preference for lamb increased as the standard of living increased.

5. Sixty-two per cent of the housewives of the American white group indicated that steaks and chops were bought because of their palatability, 40 per cent stated this as the reason for buying roasts, and 29.4 per cent assigned this reason for using boiling meat. Convenience of preparation was of more importance in the use of steaks and chops than in the use of roasts and boiling meat. Economy was given greater weight by the housewives as a reason for using roasts and boiling meat than for using steaks and chops.

6. Meat was served in the households of the American white group an average of 2.1 times per week for each of the meals breakfast and lunch and 5.6 times per week at dinner. Meat was served most frequently in the homes of the poor and middle class colored families, and least frequently in the homes of Italian and Jewish families.

7. Palatability was emphasized by about 50 per cent of the housewives, with the exception of a few foreign groups, as the reason for serving meat in preference to other foods.

8. Fish was the food named by the largest number of women of the American white group as the first choice of a food to take the place of meat when meat was not served. Vegetables were

second and eggs third, according to the number of women indicating each of them as first choice of a food when meat was not served. As the standard of living increased, the popularity of fish and poultry increased, with a decrease in the preference for vegetables, dairy products, soup, baked beans, cereals, and bread as food to be served in place of meat.

9. Variety was emphasized most frequently by the housewives of the American white group as the reason for using other foods instead of meat. Economy was stated more frequently as a reason for serving other foods by the housewives of the poor class of the American white group and of the English, Finnish, German, Italian, and Polish groups. Religious reasons were also important in the English, German, Italian, Polish, and Russian groups.

MEAT PURCHASING

10. Over 50 per cent of the housewives of the American white group and of the colored group bought meat at unit combination grocery and meat markets. In the foreign groups, however, the decided preference, with slight exception, was for straight meat markets.

11. The near-by meat dealer had the advantage, since in most of the groups and classes about one-half of the housewives bought their meat at markets within two blocks of their homes. The principal exceptions were found in the well-to-do and wealthy classes of the American white group and in the Scandinavian group. There was also indicated a definite and pronounced tendency to trade with the nearest or the next to the nearest dealer.

12. As the standard of living increased, increase in the tendency to charge meat purchases was more rapid than that of trading at markets where charge service was available.

13. Housewives of the poor and middle classes of the American white group had patronized their present meat dealers a shorter length of time than had those of the well-to-do and wealthy classes.

14. Quality of meat was most frequently stated as the reason for trading with present meat dealers. The relative importance of quality of meat and good service as reasons for trading with present meat dealers increased and the significance of the factors of convenience of location and economical prices decreased as the standard of living became better.

15. Nearly three-fourths of the housewives of the American white group stated they had never stopped trading with a dealer because of dissatisfaction. Of the remaining one-fourth, over one-half stated that they had discontinued trading because of dissatisfaction with the quality of meat. Dishonesty of the dealer and high prices were each named by about one-tenth of the American white housewives.

16. About 70 per cent of the housewives of the American white group discontinued trading with their last dealers because they had moved away from the area served by the dealers or the dealer had left the business. The remaining 30 per cent of the replies were divided among the following reasons: Poor quality of meats, inconvenience of location, high prices, poor service, business connections with new shop opening up, insanitary shop, no credit service, and changing dealers on the recommendation of other dealers by friends.

17. About 60 per cent of the housewives of the American white group personally purchased the meat used by the families, and the telephone was used by an additional 25 per cent.

18. About three-fourths of the housewives of the American white group stated that they had made up their minds regarding the kind of meat and cut of meat which they wished to buy before they went to the store.

19. About three-fourths of the housewives of the American white group stated that they did not buy meat at specially advertised prices and that they were not influenced by salesmen in their purchasing of meat.

20. One-half of the American white group of housewives said that they were influenced in their purchasing of meat by store displays.

21. The lower the standard of living the greater the price appeal admitted by housewives of the American white group.

22. Two out of each five housewives of the American white group said that they sometimes or often shopped between stores in purchasing meat. The tendency to shop between stores was more pronounced in the colored group and in some of the foreign groups than in the American white group.

23. Over four-fifths of the total number of housewives in the American white group stated that they bought meat by the pound rather than by the portion.

MEAT ADVERTISING

24. The shop poster was most frequently recalled as the form of local meat advertising, about three-fourths of the housewives of the American white group stating that they remembered posters. Russian and colored groups recalled handbills and circulars to a greater extent than the other groups.

25. Over 90 per cent of the housewives of the American white group recalled some phase of price advertising when asked what they remembered about meat advertising by local stores.

26. Quality of meat was the factor which more than half of the housewives of the American white group said that they would advertise if they were operating meat shops. An additional one-fourth said that they would stress sanitary handling of meat, and less than one-tenth said that they would use price as an advertising appeal.

CONSUMER KNOWLEDGE OF MEAT QUALITY AND CUTS

27. According to almost 50 per cent of the housewives of the American white group, their dealers handled either the best or a very good quality of meat. As only approximately 9 per cent of the cattle slaughtered were probably of these qualities, the lack of consumer knowledge of meat grades and quality was evident.

28. Three kinds of steaks and 2.3 cuts of roasts were named on the average by housewives of the American white group as the entire number of cuts which they could recognize. The small numbers of these cuts recognized did not denote familiarity with the number of steaks and roasts made available by the cutting up of a beef carcass.

QUESTIONNAIRE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

WASHINGTON

1924-25 MEAT QUESTIONNAIRE[1]

1. (*a*) How many persons in your family (other than servants)?
   (*b*) How many servants eating two or more meals daily?
   — Table 1.

2. What is your average weekly meat consumption?

Kind of meat	Pounds	Cost
Beef, steaks		
Beef, other		
Lamb, chops		
Lamb, other		
Pork		
Veal		
Smoked and cured meats		
Other (exclude poultry and sea food)		
Total		

— Total cost shown in Table 3.

3. (*a*) Do you think your family eats too much meat? _____
   Just enough? _____ Not enough? _____
   (*b*) If too much or not enough, why? _____

4. (*a*) How many men eat meat? _____ How many do not? _____
   (*b*) How many women eat meat? How many do not? _____
   (*c*) How many children 15 to 19 eat meat? _____ How many do not? _____
   (*d*) How many children 10 to 14 eat meat? _____ How many do not? _____
   (*e*) How many children 5 to 9 eat meat? _____ How many do not? _____
   (*f*) How many children under 5 eat meat? _____ How many do not? _____
   (*g*) How many servants eat meat? How many do not? _____
   — Table 4.

5. If there are any adults who do not eat meat, what are the reasons why they do not? _____ — Table 5.

6. What kind of meat is preferred in your household? _____
   Veal, lamb, pork, beef? _____
   — Tables 6, 7, and 8.

7. Why do you buy—
   (*a*) Steaks and chops? _____ Table 9.
   (*b*) Roasts? _____ Table 10.
   (*c*) Boiling meat? _____ Table 11.

8. How many times a week is meat served at the following meals:
   Breakfast _____
   Lunch or supper _____
   Dinner _____
   — Tables 12 and 13.

9. Why do you serve meat in preference to other foods? _____ Table 14.

10. When you do not serve meat for dinner, what usually takes its place? _____ — Tables 15 and 16.

11. Why do you substitute these things for meat?
    1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____
    — Table 17.

[1] The questions listed here are those for which results are shown in this publication. The order of the questions as they appeared in the questionnaire has been changed but the wording and arrangement of each question is the same as that used in the questionnaire. Changes have been made in some of the questions, when used in the headings of tables and in the text in order to secure clearness of meaning when separated from the accompanying questions in the questionnaire.

12. From whom do you buy your meat?
    (*a*) Type of market? ..... Tables 18–19.
    (*b*) How many blocks is he from you? ..... Table 20.
    (*c*) How many dealers are nearer? ..... Table 21.
    (*d*) Does he extend a charge service? ..... Table 22.
    (*e*) Do you ordinarily have your meat charged? ..... Table 22.
    (*f*) What grade of meat does your butcher handle? ..... Table 23.
    (*g*) How long have you bought from him? ..... Tables 24–25.
    (*h*) Why do you buy from him in preference to others? ..... Table 26.
    (*i*) Have you ever stopped trading with a butcher because of dissatisfaction? ..... Table 27.
    (*j*) What was the reason? ..... Table 27.
    (*k*) Why did you stop buying from your last meat dealer? Table 28.
13. (a) Where have you seen fresh meat advertised by local stores? Tables 29–30.
    (b) What do you remember about the advertising? ..... Table 31
14. If you owned a market, what would you advertise about your meat? ..... Tables 32–33.
15. How do you purchase? Tables 34 and 35.
    (*a*) Phone
    (*b*) Children
    (*c*) Personally
    (*d*) Servant
    (*e*) Husband
    (*f*) Other adults
    (*g*) Does butcher solicit you
        (1) By phone
        (2) In person
16. How do you purchase your meat when you go to the store?
    (*a*) Mind made up as beef, pork, etc.? Yes____No____ Partly____ Tables 36–37.
    (*b*) Mind made up as to boil, roast, fry? Yes____No____ Partly____ Tables 38–39.
    (*c*) Do you buy meat at specially advertised prices? Often____Occasionally____Never____ Tables 40–41.
    (*d*) Purchase influenced by meat display? Yes____ No____Partly____ Tables 42–43.
    (*e*) Purchase influenced by salesman? Yes____No____ Sometimes____ Tables 44–45.
    (*f*) Purchase influenced by price? Yes____No____ Partly____ Tables 46–47.
    (*g*) Ever shop between stores? Much____Some____ None____ Tables 48–49.
    (*h*) Do you buy by pound or portion? Yes____No____ Tables 50–51.
17. Name the kinds of beef steaks you can recognize if cut ..... Table 51.
    Name the beef roasts

TABLES

TABLE 1.—*Total number of households and persons and the average number of persons per household* [1]

Group	Total number of persons	Total number of household	Average number of persons per household
American white:			
Poor class	3,654	751	4.9
Middle class	3,177	782	4.1
Well-to-do class	3,354	796	4.2
Wealthy class	3,184	583	5.5
Total American white	13,369	2,912	4.6
Colored:			
Poor class	805	203	4.0
Middle class	818	197	4.2
Total colored	1,623	400	4.1
Foreign:			
English	413	100	4.1
Finnish	208	45	4.6
French	256	50	5.1
German	768	175	4.4
Italian	1,583	276	5.7
Jewish	534	113	4.7
Polish	1,057	195	5.4
Russian	308	50	6.2
Scandinavian	625	150	4.2
Total foreign	5,752	1,154	5.0
Total all groups	20,744	4,466	4.6

[1] Servants eating two or more meals daily have been included in the total number of persons and in the average number of persons per household.

TABLE 2.—*Number of questionnaires by city and class of family*

Group	Baltimore	Binghamton	Birmingham	Denver	Fargo	Grand Forks	Jacksonville	Lincoln
American white:								
Poor class	50	40	50	51	50	50	51	50
Middle class	45	39	50	47	50	51	50	50
Well-to-do class	49	50	50	50	50	50	49	50
Wealthy class	----	6	50	50	50	50	----	50
Total American white	144	135	200	198	200	201	150	200
Colored:								
Poor class	----	----	50	----	----	----	53	----
Middle class	----	----	50	----	----	----	47	----
Total colored	----	----	100	----	----	----	100	----
Foreign:								
English	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Finnish	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
French	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
German	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Italian	51	50	----	50	----	----	----	----
Jewish	4	8	----	----	----	----	----	----
Polish	49	48	----	----	----	----	----	----
Russian	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Scandinavian	----	----	----	----	50	50	----	----
Total foreign	104	106	----	50	50	50	----	----
Total all groups	248	241	300	248	250	251	250	200

TABLE 2.—*Number of questionnaires by city and class of family*—Continued

Group	Minneapolis	New Haven	New Orleans	Oklahoma City	Philadelphia	Pittsburgh	San Francisco	Washington	Total
American white:									
Poor class	50	44	50	50	50	50	15	50	751
Middle class	50	52	50	50	48	50	50	50	782
Well-to-do class	50	51	50	50	49	49	50	49	796
Wealthy class	50	------	50	50	50	50	50	27	583
Total American white	200	147	200	200	197	199	165	176	2,912
Colored:									
Poor class	------	------	50	------	------	------	------	50	203
Middle class	------	------	50	------	------	------	------	50	197
Total colored	------	------	100	------	------	------	------	100	400
Foreign:									
English	------	------	------	------	50	50	------	------	100
Finnish	45	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	45
French	------	------	50	------	------	------	------	------	50
German	50	------	------	------	50	50	25	------	175
Italian	------	------	------	------	50	50	25	------	276
Jewish	------	------	------	------	50	51	------	------	113
Polish	------	------	------	------	48	50	------	------	195
Russian	50	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	50
Scandinavian	50	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	150
Total foreign	195	------	50	------	248	251	50	------	1,154
Total all groups	395	147	350	200	445	450	215	276	4,466

TABLE 3.—*Replies to the question: What is the cost of the meat consumed per week in your household?*

Group	Total number of households	Average cost per week per household
American white:		
Poor class[1]	644	$2.73
Middle class[1]	670	3.13
Well-to-do class[1]	685	3.50
Wealthy class[2]	480	5.03
Total American white	2,479	3.49
Colored:		
Poor class	202	2.41
Middle class	196	3.38
Foreign:		
Finnish	45	2.40
German	76	3.24
Italian	156	2.16
Polish	91	3.25
Russian	50	3.96
Scandinavian	150	2.31

[1] Replies from Baltimore, Binghamton, Birmingham, Denver, Fargo, Grand Forks, Jacksonville, Lincoln, Minneapolis, New Haven, New Orleans, Oklahoma City, San Francisco, and Washington.

[2] Replies from the cities listed in footnote [1] with the exceptions of Baltimore, Jacksonville, and New Haven.

TABLE 4.—*Replies to questions relative to number of persons not eating meat*

[Philadelphia and Pittsburgh not included]

Group	Family members														Servants	
	Total number	Per cent of total not eating meat	Men over 19 years		Women over 19 years		Children 15–19 years		Children 10–14 years		Children 5–9 years		Children under 5 years		Total number	Per cent not eating meat
			Number	Per cent[1]	Number	Per cent[1]	Number	Per cent[1]	Number	Per cent[1]	Number	Per cent[1]	Number	Per cent[1]		
American white:																
Poor class	3,138	6.8	804	1.4	865	3.0	214	2.3	363	0.3	436	3.2	456	34.2	1	0
Middle class	2,736	6.3	876	1.7	1,001	4.1	195	3.1	211	2.4	233	6.0	220	41.8	21	0
Well-to-do class	2,764	4.7	870	1.5	1,151	3.6	172	0	197	2.5	203	5.4	171	35.9	162	1.2
Wealthy class [2]	1,937	3.4	614	2.1	742	2.7	113	0	156	0	159	.6	153	20.9	662	.3
Total American white	10,575	5.5	3,164	1.6	3,759	3.4	694	1.6	927	1.2	1,031	3.9	1,000	34.1	846	.5
Colored:																
Poor class	803	3.5	224	.4	275	2.5	64	0	75	0	86	0	79	25.3	2	0
Middle class	817	4.0	265	.8	293	2.4	64	0	61	0	61	3.3	73	30.1	1	0
Foreign:																
Finnish	208	.5	63	1.6	61	0	15	0	22	0	21	0	26	0		
French	237	8.9	69	1.4	88	3.4	22	0	20	0	18	16.6	20	70.0	19	
German	296	3.4	115	.9	110	3.6	15	0	23	4.3	20	0	13	30.8	3	0
Italian	1,017	4.9	259	2.3	251	3.6	99	4.0	132	4.5	143	4.2	133	14.3		
Jewish	42	7.1	15	6.7	15	6.7	7	0	2	0	2	50.0	1	0	1	0
Polish	547	8.4	130	.8	117	.9	45	0	69	7.2	96	5.2	90	37.8		
Russian	308	1.9	80	0	78	2.6	37	0	54	0	39	0	20	20.0		
Scandinavian	623	4.2	194	1.0	195	3.1	60	0	62	0	65	3.1	47	34.0	2	50.0

[1] Percentage in each case is based on the number to the left of the indicated percentage. For example, 1.4 per cent of the 804 men over 19 years of age in the poor class of the American white group did not eat meat.

[2] Replies from Binghamton, Birmingham, Denver, Fargo, Grand Forks, Lincoln, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Oklahoma City, San Francisco, and Washington.

TABLE 5.—*Replies to the question: If there are any adults who do not eat meat, what are the reasons why they do not?*

Group	Total number of adults replying	Percentage replying—		
		Diet	Distaste	High cost
American white:				
Poor class[1]	37	62.2	32.4	5.4
Middle class[2]	61	78.7	19.7	1.6
Well-to-do class[3]	61	75.4	23.0	1.6
Wealthy class[4]	37	73.0	27.0	
Total American white	196	73.4	24.5	2.1

[1] Replies from 14 cities, Fargo and New Orleans not included.
[2] Replies from 14 cities, Fargo and Lincoln not included.
[3] Replies from 15 cities, Jacksonville not included.
[4] Replies from 11 cities, Baltimore, Fargo, Jacksonville, New Haven, and San Francisco not included.

TABLE 6.—*Replies to the quesiton: What kind of meat is preferred in your household?* [1]

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—			
		Beef	Pork	Lamb	Veal
American white: [2]					
Poor class	561	55.3	35.2	2.5	7.0
Middle class	584	65.4	18.7	7.7	8.2
Well-to-do class	571	73.5	7.9	12.0	6.6
Wealthy class	554	71.3	5.2	17.5	6.0
Total American white	2,270	66.4	16.8	9.9	6.9
Colored: [3]					
Poor class	150	23.3	61.4	4.6	10.7
Middle class	147	49.6	26.6	6.8	17.0
Foreign:					
English	86	79.1	8.1	11.6	1.2
Finnish	45	51.1	24.4	----	24.5
French	50	52.0	6.0	----	42.0
German	164	65.2	18.3	12.8	3.7
Italian	161	43.5	5.6	7.4	43.5
Jewish	95	67.4	----	15.8	16.8
Polish	94	80.9	8.5	----	10.6
Russian	50	52.0	28.0	----	20.0
Scandinavian	143	53.8	37.8	1.4	7.0

[1] Replies from Baltimore, Binghamton, Jacksonville, and New Haven are shown in Table 8, where replies indicating the preferences of individual members of the family are tabulated.
[2] Replies from 12 cities, Birmingham, Denver, Fargo, Grand Forks, Lincoln, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Oklahoma City, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, and Washington.
[3] Replies from Birmingham, New Orleans, and Washington.

TABLE 7.—*Replies by cities to the question: What kind of meat is preferred in your household?*

[Middle class and well-to-do class American white replies combined]

City	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—			
		Beef	Pork	Lamb	Veal
Birmingham	100	72.0	16.0	11.0	1.0
Denver	95	84.2	4.2	5.3	6.3
Fargo	94	71.3	20.2	----	8.5
Grand Forks	99	66.7	28.3	----	5.0
Lincoln	100	78.0	15.0	3.0	4.0
Minneapolis	100	82.0	12.0	6.0	----
New Orleans	100	45.0	6.0	4.0	45.0
Oklahoma City	94	73.4	21.3	4.2	1.1
Philadelphia	92	64.1	8.7	25.0	2.2
Pittsburgh	90	66.7	13.3	14.4	5.6
San Francisco	97	57.7	4.1	33.0	5.2
Washington	94	72.3	10.6	12.8	4.3
All cities	1155	69.5	13.2	9.8	7.5

TABLE 8.—*Replies to the question: What kinds of meat are preferred by the individual members of your household?* [1]

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—			
		Beef	Pork	Lamb	Veal
American white: [2]					
Poor class	181	59.7	28.2	4.4	7.7
Middle class	206	60.7	19.4	12.6	7.3
Well-to-do class	218	57.8	9.6	29.4	3.2
Total American white	605	59.3	18.5	16.2	6.0
Colored: [3]					
Poor class	50	44.0	52.0	4.0	----
Middle class	50	50.0	38.0	12.0	----
Foreign: [4]					
Italian	99	41.4	19.2	1.0	38.4
Polish	66	60.6	31.8	----	7.6

[1] For other replies indicative of preference for kinds of meat see Table 6.
[2] Replies from Baltimore, Binghamton, Jacksonville, and New Haven.
[3] Replies from Jacksonville.
[4] Replies from Baltimore and Binghamton.

TABLE 9.—*Replies to the question: Why do you buy steaks and chops?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—										
		Palatability	Variety	Convenience	Food value	Small family	Health	Economy	Habit	Serve for more than one meal	Combine with other food	Large family
American white: [1]												
Poor class	169	65.1	20.7	10.1	1.7	------	0.6	1.2	0.6	------	------	------
Middle class	204	60.3	18.6	11.8	3.4	2.9	2.5	.5	------	------	------	------
Well-to-do class	252	61.0	13.5	15.1	1.6	3.2	1.6	2.0	2.0	------	------	------
Total American white	625	62.0	17.1	12.6	2.2	2.2	1.6	1.3	1.0	------	------	------
Colored [2]	86	81.4	8.1	1.2	2.3	1.2	3.4	1.2	1.2	------	------	------
Italian [3]	71	84.6	9.8	2.8	------	------	1.4	------	------	------	1.4	------
Polish [3]	68	80.9	13.2	2.9	------	------	1.5	------	1.5	------	------	------
CITY												
Baltimore, white	123	70.6	15.5	4.1	2.5	.8	3.3	2.4	.8	------	------	------
Binghamton, white	161	64.5	9.3	15.5	.7	6.2	1.9	------	1.9	------	------	------
Jacksonville, white	136	72.1	7.4	11.7	2.2	1.5	.7	2.9	1.5	------	------	------
New Haven, white	138	61.6	21.7	10.2	5.1	------	.7	.7	------	------	------	------
Washington, white	67	19.4	49.3	28.3	------	1.5	1.5	------	------	------	------	------

[1] Replies from Baltimore, Binghamton, Jacksonville, New Haven, and Washington.
[2] Replies from Jacksonville.
[3] Replies from Baltimore and Binghamton.

TABLE 10.—*Replies to the question: Why do you buy roasts?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—										
		Palatability	Variety	Convenience	Food value	Small family	Health	Economy	Habit	Serve for more than one meal	Combine with other foods	Large family
American white:[1]												
Poor class	137	46.0	31.4	5.1	0.7	------	------	9.5	2.2	4.4	------	0.7
Middle class	160	35.0	30.0	5.0	1.9	------	3.7	11.2	1.3	10.0	0.6	1.3
Well-to-do class	220	40.0	22.3	5.9	2.3	------	4.1	14.1	2.3	6.8	------	2.2
Total American white	517	40.0	27.0	5.4	1.7	------	2.9	12.0	2.0	7.2	.2	1.6
Colored[2]	60	55.0	35.0	------	1.7	------	3.3	3.3	------	1.7	------	------
Italian[3]	50	62.0	32.0	------	------	------	4.0	2.0	------	------	------	------
Polish[3]	41	53.8	34.2	------	2.4	------	2.4	2.4	------	2.4	------	2.4
CITY												
Baltimore, white	122	40.2	34.4	.8	.8	------	.8	13.1	1.7	5.7	.8	1.7
Binghamton, white	149	42.3	20.1	2.0	2.0	------	3.4	14.1	4.0	8.7	------	3.4
Jacksonville, while	112	35.7	40.2	.9	3.6	------	4.5	10.7	------	3.5	------	.9
New Haven, white	108	48.2	18.5	20.4	.9	------	3.7	5.6	1.8	.9	------	------
Washington, white	26	11.5	11.5	3.9	------	------	------	26.9	------	46.2	------	------

[1] Replies from Baltimore, Binghamton, Jacksonville, New Haven, and Washington.
[2] Replies from Jacksonville.
[3] Replies from Baltimore and Binghamton.

TABLE 11.—*Replies to the question: Why do you buy boiling meat?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—										
		Palatability	Variety	Convenience	Food value	Small family	Health	Economy	Habit	Serve for more than one meal	Combine with other foods	Large family
American white: [1]												
Poor class	121	33.1	23.2	1.6	0.8	------	3.3	6.6	------	1.6	29.8	------
Middle class	104	26.0	24.0	1.0	3.8	------	5.8	4.8	------	1.9	32.7	------
Well-to-do class	108	28.7	28.7	.9	1.9	------	1.9	11.1	0.9	------	25.9	------
Total American white	333	29.4	25.2	1.2	2.1	------	3.6	7.5	.3	1.2	29.5	------
Colored [2]	66	34.8	19.7	------	3.0	------	3.0	6.1	------	------	33.4	------
Italian [3]	62	32.2	14.5	------	------	------	4.9	------	------	------	48.4	------
Polish [3]	61	29.5	19.7	------	------	------	1.6	8.2	------	------	41.0	------
CITY												
Baltimore, white	96	27.1	24.0	1.0	1.0	------	3.1	4.2	------	3.1	36.5	------
Binghamton, white	100	36.0	25.0	1.0	3.0	------	3.0	13.0	1.0	------	18.0	------
Jacksonville, white	70	24.3	21.4	1.4	1.4	------	5.7	7.2	------	------	38.6	------
New Haven, white	63	27.0	31.7	1.6	3.2	------	3.2	4.7	------	1.6	27.0	------
Washington, white	4	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

[1] Replies from Baltimore, Binghamton, Jacksonville, New Haven, and Washington.
[2] Replies from Jacksonville.
[3] Replies from Baltimore and Binghamton.

TABLE 12.—*Replies to the question: How many times a week is meat served at breakfast, lunch, and dinner?*

Group	Total number of replies	Average times per week per household at—		
		Breakfast	Lunch	Dinner
American white:				
Poor class[1]	701	1.8	2.1	5.3
Middle class	782	1.9	2.5	5.7
Well-to-do class	796	2.1	1.8	5.8
Wealthy class[2]	583	2.6	1.8	5.8
Total American white	2,862	2.1	2.1	5.6
Colored:				
Poor class	203	4.0	1.6	5.6
Middle class	197	4.1	2.3	5.6
Foreign:				
English	100	1.7	2.2	6.4
Finnish	45	.5	1.4	5.3
French	50	1.1	2.8	5.9
German	175	.7	1.6	6.0
Italian	227	.6	1.9	4.2
Jewish	112	.1	.6	4.3
Polish	198	1.0	2.8	5.2
Russian	50	.8	3.2	5.9
Scandinavian	150	.5	2.2	5.9

[1] Replies from 15 cities, Philadelphia not included.
[2] Replies from 13 cities, Baltimore, Jacksonville, and New Haven not included.

TABLE 13.—*Replies by cities to the question: How many times a week is meat served at breakfast, lunch, and dinner?*

[Middle class and well-to-do class American white replies combined]

City	Total number of replies	Average times per week per household at—			
		Breakfast	Lunch	Dinner	All meals combined
Baltimore	94	3.4	2.7	6.0	11.9
Binghamton	89	1.3	2.1	5.5	8.9
Birmingham	100	4.6	1.9	5.2	11.8
Denver	97	.4	1.0	5.6	7.0
Fargo	100	.4	2.0	5.8	8.2
Grand Forks	101	.6	3.5	6.0	10.0
Jacksonville	99	3.6	3.1	5.2	11.9
Lincoln	100	1.9	1.6	6.6	10.1
Minneapolis	100	1.1	1.7	6.5	9.3
New Haven	103	.9	2.9	5.9	9.4
New Orleans	100	1.9	2.6	5.9	10.4
Oklahoma City	100	3.3	1.3	5.5	10.0
Philadelphia	97	1.1	3.6	4.8	9.4
Pittsburgh	99	2.2	2.1	5.6	9.9
San Francisco	100	2.2	1.2	5.8	9.2
Washington	99	3.5	1.7	5.9	11.2
All cities	1,578	2.0	2.2	5.8	10.0

TABLE 14.—*Replies to the question: Why do you serve meat in preference to other foods?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—							
		Palatability	Food value	Habit or custom	Main dish of meal	Balanced meal	Easy preparation	Variety	Protein content
American white:[1]									
Poor class	532	58.8	28.0	5.1	4.9	0.8	1.5	0.9	------
Middle class	554	50.5	29.6	12.5	3.8	.9	1.6	.9	0.2
Well-to-do class	559	47.8	30.4	11.1	5.9	2.2	1.3	.9	.4
Wealthy class	538	47.3	30.1	9.9	5.8	3.0	1.5	2.0	.4
Total American white	2,183	51.1	29.5	9.7	5.1	1.7	1.5	1.2	.2
Colored:[2]									
Poor class	145	74.5	16.5	2.7	2.7	------	1.4	2.2	------
Middle class	148	64.2	25.0	6.7	------	.7	2.7	.7	------
Foreign:									
English	80	55.0	27.5	10.0	1.2	------	------	6.3	------
Finnish	45	35.6	33.3	17.8	4.5	------	2.2	4.4	2.2
French	40	45.0	15.0	27.5	10.0	------	2.5	------	------
German	160	35.6	28.1	30.0	.6	1.9	------	3.8	------
Italian[3]	84	34.5	46.4	10.7	2.4	------	2.4	3.6	------
Jewish[4]	88	42.0	44.4	9.1	------	1.1	1.1	2.3	------
Polish[4]	71	83.1	12.7	2.8	1.4	------	------	------	------
Russian	44	36.4	40.9	9.1	2.3	------	------	11.3	------
Scandinavian	138	50.7	26.8	13.0	2.2	2.2	5.1	------	------

[1] Replies from 12 cities: Birmingham, Denver, Fargo, Grand Forks, Lincoln, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Oklahoma City, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, and Washington.
[2] Replies from Birmingham, New Orleans, and Washington.
[3] Replies from Denver, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and San Francisco.
[4] Replies from Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

TABLE 15.—*Replies to the question: When you do not serve meat for dinner, what is your first choice of a food to take its place?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage indicating first choice of—										
		Fish	Vegetables	Eggs	Spaghetti	Dairy products	Poultry	Soup	Baked beans	Cereals	Bread	Salads
American white:												
Poor class	622	22.2	31.1	18.8	4.8	6.6	1.8	4.2	2.9	3.7	3.4	0.5
Middle class	658	27.7	23.0	23.2	6.4	6.4	4.1	3.0	2.1	2.1	.9	1.1
Well-to-do class	684	32.0	17.4	22.2	9.5	5.4	6.7	1.8	1.3	1.2	.6	1.9
Wealthy class[1]	505	40.7	11.6	15.8	8.2	5.7	12.7	.8	1.7	.4	1.0	1.4
Total American white	2,469	30.2	21.2	20.3	7.2	6.0	6.0	2.5	2.0	1.9	1.5	1.2
Colored:												
Poor class	128	37.5	37.5	6.2	------	4.7	.8	2.3	4.7	5.5	.8	------
Middle class	133	45.9	30.1	3.0	1.5	9.8	2.2	------	3.0	1.5	.8	2.2
Foreign:												
English	89	36.0	30.3	19.1	1.1	3.4	5.6	------	------	2.3	1.1	1.1
Finnish	44	43.2	15.9	18.1	11.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	------	------
French	40	65.0	12.5	7.5	------	------	7.5	2.5	5.0	------	------	------
German	153	37.9	13.1	31.4	3.3	1.9	3.3	1.3	2.6	1.9	3.3	------
Italian	264	14.0	19.7	7.6	42.0	1.5	3.0	10.6	.8	------	------	.8
Jewish	106	33.0	18.9	13.2	1.9	14.2	16.0	------	------	------	1.9	.9
Polish	191	25.7	14.7	17.8	3.7	9.4	.5	4.7	1.0	11.0	11.5	------
Russian	47	19.1	21.2	23.8	6.3	8.5	4.2	6.4	4.2	2.1	4.2	------
Scandinavian	142	43.0	4.9	27.5	2.1	9.9	------	2.1	2.1	3.5	4.2	.7

[1] Replies from 13 cities; Baltimore, Jacksonville, and New Haven not included.

TABLE 16.—*Replies by cities to the question: When you do not serve meat for dinner, what is your first choice of a food to take its place?*

[Middle class and well-to-do class American white replies combined]

City	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—										
		Fish	Vegetables	Eggs	Spaghetti	Dairy products	Poultry	Soup	Baked beans	Cereals	Bread	Salads
Baltimore	40	52.5	17.5	15.0	------	2.5	2.5	5.0	------	------	2.5	2.5
Binghamton	86	25.6	25.6	25.6	5.8	5.8	3.5	3.5	1.2	1.2	------	2.2
Birmingham	99	9.2	57.6	13.2	5.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	1.0	------	1.0	1.0
Denver	85	27.1	15.3	22.4	12.9	3.5	9.4	4.7	------	2.3	1.2	1.2
Fargo	96	34.4	8.3	34.4	10.5	8.3	------	2.1	------	1.0	1.0	------
Grand Forks	95	21.0	10.5	40.0	14.8	4.2	------	4.2	------	5.3	------	------
Jacksonville	62	16.1	32.2	14.5	13.0	6.5	9.7	------	1.6	1.6	1.6	3.2
Lincoln	98	------	17.3	39.8	15.3	17.3	------	1.0	7.2	2.1	------	------
Minneapolis	94	28.7	20.2	33.0	2.1	4.3	2.1	2.1	4.3	1.1	2.1	------
New Haven	90	36.7	17.8	18.9	6.6	8.9	------	3.3	3.3	------	------	4.5
New Orleans	73	64.5	12.3	6.9	1.3	4.1	9.6	------	1.3	------	------	------
Oklahoma City	81	12.4	40.7	12.4	7.4	12.4	4.9	4.9	3.7	------	1.2	------
Philadelphia	89	38.2	15.7	19.2	3.4	1.1	12.3	------	------	6.7	------	3.4
Pittsburgh	84	28.5	11.9	25.0	10.7	3.6	10.7	2.4	------	2.4	1.2	3.6
San Francisco	81	45.6	8.7	16.1	8.7	2.5	13.6	1.2	1.2	1.2	------	1.2
Washington	89	57.4	9.0	13.5	5.6	1.1	6.8	2.2	1.1	------	1.1	2.2
All cities	1,342	29.9	20.1	22.7	7.9	5.9	5.4	2.5	1.7	1.6	.8	1.5

TABLE 17.—*Replies to the question: Why do you use other foods instead of meat?* [1]

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—										
		Variety	Palatability	Food value	Health	Economy	Religion	Convenience	Distaste for too much meat	Balanced diet	Custom and habit	Children's health
American white:												
Poor class	1,051	31.1	25.1	6.1	8.4	15.5	4.2	3.5	2.0	1.1	1.6	1.4
Middle class	1,188	35.2	21.6	11.5	10.9	6.6	5.7	3.5	2.4	.8	1.0	.8
Well-to-do class	1,141	38.4	20.0	13.1	12.4	2.5	4.4	1.9	2.7	2.9	1.4	.3
Wealthy class [2]	842	40.3	21.6	15.6	11.6	.5	5.3	.8	1.0	2.1	.7	.5
Total American white	4,222	36.1	22.1	11.3	10.8	6.5	4.9	2.6	2.1	1.7	1.2	.7
Colored:												
Poor class	218	37.6	30.7	6.0	7.3	6.9	3.7	4.1	------	2.8	------	.9
Middle class	229	31.9	32.8	10.5	13.1	3.0	3.5	2.6	------	1.3	1.3	------
Foreign:												
English	203	41.4	11.3	2.5	5.4	11.3	11.3	1.5	3.5	7.9	3.9	------
Finnish	59	55.9	1.7	5.1	5.1	23.7	------	3.4	1.7	1.7	------	1.7
French	61	29.5	41.0	3.3	1.6	4.9	1.7	13.1	------	------	4.9	------
German	246	54.5	3.7	.8	9.3	11.0	11.0	1.2	2.0	4.5	1.6	.4
Italian	396	21.7	36.4	2.0	5.8	14.9	13.6	1.8	.2	.5	2.3	.8
Jewish	154	38.3	26.0	1.9	20.8	4.5	------	3.9	.6	3.3	.7	------
Polish	354	34.2	19.2	------	2.8	15.8	24.6	.8	2.0	------	.6	------
Russian	57	54.4	------	------	7.0	7.0	19.3	3.5	3.5	------	------	5.3
Scandinavian	204	44.1	25.5	8.8	7.8	4.9	------	1.5	4.9	1.0	1.0	.5

[1] All reasons given in answer to this question have been combined. The number of replies indicated is therefore larger than the number of questionnaires procured in the various cities.

[2] Replies from 13 cities; Baltimore, Jacksonville, and New Haven not included.

TABLE 18.—*Replies to the question as to type of market patronized*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—								
		Unit combination meat and grocery	Unit straight meat market	Stall in public market	Chain combination meat and grocery store	Chain straight meat market	Wholesale meat market	Department store meat market	Farmers' market	Cooperative or commissary
American white:	686	57.2	30.6	9.9	1.9	0.3	-------	-------	0.1	-------
Poor class	721	52.6	34.0	9.5	2.9	.7	0.1	-------	.1	0.1
Middle class	728	50.4	33.5	10.6	3.8	1.3	.3	0.1	-------	-------
Well-to-do class	557	45.6	36.1	13.1	3.6	.9	.5	.2	-------	-------
Wealthy class[1]										
Total American white	2,692	51.9	33.4	10.5	3.0	.8	.2	.1	.1	-------
Colored:										
Poor class	189	53.4	16.4	19.6	7.4	-------	-------	-------	-------	3.2
Middle class	173	56.1	19.6	19.1	2.9	-------	-------	-------	-------	2.3
Foreign:										
English	97	39.2	46.4	3.1	10.3	1.0	-------	-------	-------	-------
Finnish	43	9.3	90.7	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
French	49	26.5	47.0	26.5	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
German	169	36.7	52.1	4.7	6.5	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Italian	240	35.4	52.9	11.3	-------	-------	.4	-------	-------	-------
Jewish	106	22.6	77.4	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Polish	166	59.6	20.5	19.9	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Russian	49	16.3	83.7	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Scandinavian	148	34.5	64.8	-------	-------	.7	-------	-------	-------	-------

[1] Replies from 13 cities; Baltimore, Jacksonville, and New Haven not included.

TABLE 19.—*Replies by cities to the question as to type of market patronized*

[Middle class and well-to-do class American white replies combined]

City	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—								
		Unit combination meat market and grocery store	Unit straight meat market	Stall in public market	Chain combination meat and grocery store	Chain straight meat market	Wholesale meat market	Department store meat market	Farmers' market	Cooperative or commissary
Baltimore	84	45.2	16.6	35.8	1.2	1.2	-------	-------	-------	-------
Binghamton	72	29.1	66.7	2.8	-------	-------	-------	1.4	-------	-------
Birmingham	99	68.6	13.2	6.1	11.1	-------	-------	-------	-------	1.0
Denver	93	51.5	45.2	-------	-------	-------	3.3	-------	-------	-------
Fargo	97	26.8	72.2	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	1.0	-------
Grand Forks	99	76.8	20.2	-------	-------	3.0	-------	-------	-------	-------
Jacksonville	84	34.5	53.6	-------	11.9	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Lincoln	100	86.0	12.0	-------	2.0	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Minneapolis	94	25.5	73.4	-------	-------	1.1	-------	-------	-------	-------
New Haven	85	83.5	15.3	1.2	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
New Orleans	97	9.3	38.1	43.5	3.1	1.0	-------	-------	-------	-------
Oklahoma City	83	89.2	3.6	-------	3.6	3.6	-------	-------	-------	-------
Philadelphia	96	26.1	47.9	10.4	15.6	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Pittsburgh	89	34.9	46.0	13.5	-------	5.6	-------	-------	-------	-------
San Francisco	80	68.7	13.8	15.0	2.5	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Washington	97	67.0	3.1	27.8	2.1	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
All cities	1,449	51.6	33.6	10.2	3.4	1.0	.2	[1]	[1]	[1]

[1] Less than 0.1 per cent.

TABLE 20.—*Replies to the question: How many blocks is your meat dealer's store from you?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—							
		Same block	1 block	2 blocks	3 blocks	4 blocks	5 blocks	6 to 10 blocks	Over 10 blocks
American white:									
Poor class	671	7.9	30.2	16.4	12.2	6.1	4.5	9.4	13.3
Middle class	719	9.5	24.7	13.6	8.6	6.8	4.9	12.7	19.2
Well-to-do class	706	5.2	11.7	13.5	6.8	7.7	6.8	14.7	33.6
Wealthy[1]	543	.7	3.5	6.4	7.6	5.7	7.0	15.9	53.2
Total American white	2,639	6.2	18.3	12.8	8.8	6.6	5.7	13.0	28.6
Colored:									
Poor class	187	16.0	29.4	17.1	6.4	8.6	5.9	4.8	11.8
Middle class	175	11.1	21.2	8.0	9.7	6.3	4.6	13.7	19.4
Foreign:									
English	89	1.1	27.0	25.8	15.7	2.3	2.3	10.1	15.7
Finnish	43	11.6	30.2	23.2	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0
French	50	2.0	18.0	16.0	10.0	18.0	8.0	10.0	18.0
German	157	7.0	30.0	26.1	8.3	10.8	3.2	5.7	8.9
Italian	239	8.8	35.6	14.2	14.7	12.1	5.4	3.8	5.4
Jewish	81	8.6	34.6	21.0	11.1	9.9		6.2	8.6
Polish	153	7.2	37.3	20.9	15.7	14.4	.6	3.3	.6
Russian	49	14.3	22.4	22.5	8.2	10.2	6.1	14.3	2.0
Scandinavian	148	2.7	8.8	12.2	10.1	11.5	9.4	33.1	12.2

[1] Replies from 13 cities; Baltimore, Jacksonville, and New Haven not included.

TABLE 21.—*Replies to the question: How many dealers nearer than your dealer's shop?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—						
		None	1	2	3	4	5 to 10	Over 10
American white:								
Poor class	632	48.7	18.8	7.0	5.4	2.2	5.9	12.0
Middle class	687	38.7	16.6	9.8	4.5	5.1	7.4	17.9
Well-to-do class	658	36.2	12.9	7.6	5.8	4.3	9.2	24.0
Wealthy class[1]	482	27.0	7.5	5.6	5.8	2.3	17.8	34.0
Total American white	2,459	38.3	14.4	7.7	5.3	3.6	9.5	21.2
Colored:								
Poor class	183	44.8	21.8	7.1	4.4	3.3	.6	18.0
Middle class	170	41.8	14.1	8.2	7.1	3.5	1.2	24.1
Foreign:								
English	84	40.5	25.0	2.4	5.9	3.6	11.9	10.7
Finnish	42	40.5	42.9	7.1	2.4			7.1
French	46	63.0	10.8	10.9	4.4		2.2	8.7
German	153	47.1	26.8	11.1	5.2	1.3	3.9	4.6
Italian	225	46.2	23.6	8.9	5.8	1.3	.9	13.3
Jewish	76	26.3	25.0	7.9	22.4	6.6	6.6	5.2
Polish	135	37.8	18.6	26.6	5.9	2.2	5.2	3.7
Russian	47	51.1	21.2	19.1	6.4	2.2		
Scandinavian	147	29.9	19.7	14.3	0.5	12.2	12.2	2.2

[1] Replies from 13 cities; Baltimore, Jacksonville, and New Haven not included.

TABLE 22.—*Replies to the questions: Does your meat dealer extend a charge service? and do you ordinarily have your meat charged?*

Group	Total number of replies	Does your meat dealer extend a charge service?		Do you ordinarily have your meat charged?	
		Percentage replying—		Percentage replying—	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
American white:[1]					
Poor class	374	66.0	34.0	29.4	70.6
Middle class	383	66.3	33.7	27.7	72.3
Well-to-do class	413	74.8	25.2	54.5	45.5
Wealthy class	440	84.5	15.5	73.4	26.6
Total American white	1,610	73.4	26.6	47.5	52.5
Colored:[2]					
Poor class	119	41.2	58.8	15.1	84.9
Middle class	119	48.7	51.3	21.0	79.0
Foreign:					
Finnish	39	61.5	38.5	23.1	76.9
French	30	83.3	16.7	63.3	36.7
German[3]	59	86.4	13.6	33.9	66.1
Italian[4]	55	76.4	23.6	45.5	54.5
Russian	46	97.8	2.2	65.2	34.8
Scandinavian	136	70.6	29.4	23.5	76.5

[1] Replies from 10 cities: Birmingham, Denver, Fargo, Grand Forks, Lincoln, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Oklahoma City, San Francisco, and Washington.
[2] Replies from Birmingham, New Orleans, and Washington.
[3] Replies from Minneapolis and San Francisco.
[4] Replies from Denver and San Francisco.

TABLE 23.—*Replies to the question: What quality of meat does your dealer handle?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—					
		Best	Very good	Good	Fair	Ordinary	Poor
American white:[1]							
Poor class	406	21.4	5.2	53.7	17.0	2.2	0.5
Middle class	445	32.6	8.5	49.7	8.1	.7	.4
Well-to-do class	447	37.8	19.9	38.0	3.6	.7	----
Wealthy class	450	45.1	21.1	32.0	1.6	.2	----
Total American white	1,748	34.6	13.9	43.1	7.3	.9	.2
Colored:[2]							
Poor class	140	15.7	5.7	70.7	7.9	----	----
Middle class	143	14.0	9.1	69.1	7.0	----	----
Foreign:							
Finnish	42	38.1	19.0	35.7	7.2	----	----
French	40	30.0	35.0	25.0	7.5	----	2.5
German[3]	66	54.5	9.1	31.8	4.6	----	----
Italian[4]	60	25.0	15.0	56.7	3.3	----	----
Russian	47	29.8	10.6	55.3	4.3	----	----
Scandinavian	135	28.1	17.8	48.9	5.2	----	----

[1] Replies from 10 cities: Birmingham, Denver, Fargo, Grand Forks, Lincoln, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Oklahoma City, San Francisco, and Washington.
[2] Replies from 3 cities: Birmingham, New Orleans, and Washington.
[3] Replies from Minneapolis and San Francisco.
[4] Replies from Denver and San Francisco.

TABLE 24.—*Replies to the question: How long have you bought meat from your present dealer?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—					
		6 months or less	7 to 12 months	13 to 24 months	25 months to 5 years	5 to 10 years	Over 10 years
American white:							
Poor class	696	14.5	21.4	21.7	23.0	11.2	8.2
Middle class	726	16.7	16.7	22.6	24.2	10.9	8.9
Well-to-do class	714	11.8	14.0	20.3	30.9	10.5	12.5
Wealthy class [1]	556	5.2	11.7	15.1	32.7	18.2	17.1
Total American white	2,692	12.4	16.2	20.2	27.4	12.4	11.4
Colored:							
Poor class	190	17.4	15.3	18.9	23.2	12.6	12.6
Middle class	178	15.7	12.4	19.7	29.2	17.4	5.6
Foreign:							
English	97	6.2	13.4	25.8	29.9	13.4	11.3
Finnish	43	9.3	9.3	9.3	34.9	27.9	9.3
French	50	16.0	14.0	8.0	32.0	16.0	14.0
German	168	5.4	7.7	19.0	23.8	17.3	26.8
Italian	237	5.9	16.0	20.3	30.0	13.5	14.3
Jewish	100	9.0	17.0	28.0	25.0	14.0	7.0
Polish	157	5.7	15.9	17.2	30.6	15.3	15.3
Russian	49	----------	12.2	42.9	20.4	14.3	10.2
Scandinavian	146	6.2	18.5	24.6	30.8	13.7	6.2

[1] Replies from 13 cities; Baltimore, Jacksonville, and New Haven not included.

TABLE 25.—*Replies by cities to the question: How long have you bought meat from your present dealer?*

[Middle class and well-to-do class American white replies combined]

City	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—					
		6 months or less	7 to 12 months	13 to 24 months	25 months to 5 years	5 to 10 years	Over 10 years
Baltimore	76	13.1	2.6	9.2	29.0	10.5	35.6
Binghamton	69	7.2	7.2	17.4	29.1	20.3	18.8
Birmingham	90	25.6	14.4	24.4	18.9	10.0	6.7
Denver	91	8.8	14.3	24.2	29.6	14.3	8.8
Fargo	97	10.3	23.7	22.7	37.1	6.2	----------
Grand Forks	99	22.2	18.3	22.2	30.3	4.0	3.0
Jacksonville	84	15.5	23.8	26.2	25.0	8.3	1.2
Lincoln	100	11.0	16.0	25.0	33.0	12.0	3.0
Minneapolis	94	15.9	14.9	18.1	24.5	13.8	12.8
New Haven	85	9.4	20.0	20.0	24.7	8.2	17.7
New Orleans	100	28.0	10.0	9.0	23.0	16.0	14.0
Oklahoma City	88	18.2	18.2	26.1	25.0	9.1	3.4
Philadelphia	96	3.1	17.7	29.2	14.6	7.3	28.1
Pittsburgh	88	6.8	12.5	18.2	45.5	9.1	7.9
San Francisco	85	18.8	17.7	14.1	25.9	15.3	8.2
Washington	98	11.2	11.2	33.6	26.6	9.2	8.2
All cities	1,440	14.2	15.3	21.5	27.6	10.7	10.7

TABLE 26.—*Replies to the question: Why do you buy from your meat dealer in preference to others?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—								
		Good quality of meat	Convenience	Economical prices	Good service	Business or social connections	Habit or custom	Sanitary shop	Pleasing personality	Charge service
American white:										
Poor class	698	35.8	34.1	12.0	1.9	6.0	2.9	2.6	2.6	2.1
Middle class	727	41.4	28.1	10.4	5.2	5.8	2.9	2.9	2.6	.7
Well-to-do class	726	48.0	22.3	5.1	9.7	5.7	4.0	3.4	1.7	.1
Wealthy class[1]	558	53.2	15.8	4.3	15.2	4.3	2.7	2.5	2.0	------
Total American white	2,709	44.2	25.5	8.2	7.6	5.5	3.1	2.9	2.2	.8
Colored:										
Poor class	189	20.6	45.5	21.7	2.1	2.1	1.6	.6	3.7	2.1
Middle class	178	28.1	35.4	16.9	2.2	6.2	2.2	3.4	1.7	3.9
Foreign:										
English	97	56.7	11.3	9.3	16.5	------	2.1	4.1	------	------
Finnish	43	55.8	25.6	------	4.7	2.3	9.3	2.3	------	------
French	49	32.7	26.5	2.0	8.2	14.3	8.2	2.0	6.1	------
German	166	45.2	30.1	3.6	9.7	7.8	2.4	1.2	------	------
Italian	240	36.2	26.2	8.3	13.8	6.3	5.4	2.1	.4	1.3
Jewish	101	58.4	14.8	2.0	10.9	------	13.9	------	------	------
Polish	160	30.6	33.8	15.0	4.4	5.6	6.2	3.1	------	1.3
Russian	49	24.5	36.7	------	4.1	22.4	8.2	4.1	------	------
Scandinavian	143	36.3	31.5	8.4	7.0	6.3	5.6	1.4	3.5	------

[1] Replies from 13 cities; Baltimore, Jacksonville, and New Haven not included.

TABLE 27.—*Replies to the questions: Have you ever stopped trading with a meat dealer because of dissatisfaction, and if so, what was the reason?*

Group	Total number of replies to questions	"No" replies		"Yes" replies		Reasons given by those replying "Yes"[1]—						
		Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Poor quality meats	Dishonest dealer	Prices high	Poor service	Insanitary shop	Lack of variety of meats	Personal differences with dealer
American white:[2]												
Poor class	444	359	80.9	85	19.1	67.2	4.7	14.1	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Middle class	458	326	71.2	132	28.8	60.6	11.3	9.8	6.1	7.6	2.3	2.3
Well-to-do class	469	342	72.9	127	27.1	52.0	16.5	11.0	6.3	10.2	1.6	2.4
Wealthy class	467	334	71.5	133	28.5	54.1	13.5	11.3	15.1	4.5	1.5	------
Total American white	1,838	1,361	74.0	477	26.0	57.6	12.2	11.3	8.2	6.7	2.1	1.9
Colored:[3]												
Poor class	150	120	80.0	30	20.0	43.3	3.4	43.3	------	3.3	6.7	------
Middle class	150	117	78.0	33	22.0	63.6	3.0	12.1	3.1	3.0	9.1	6.1
Foreign:												
Finnish	45	31	68.9	14	31.1	71.4	21.4	------	7.2	------	------	------
French	50	40	80.0	10	20.0	60.0	20.0	------	10.0	------	------	10.0
German[4]	75	60	80.0	15	20.0	66.7	13.3	20.0	------	------	------	------
Italian[5]	74	59	79.7	15	20.3	26.7	6.6	46.7	20.0	------	------	------
Russian	49	39	79.6	10	20.4	80.0	------	10.0	------	10.0	------	------
Scandinavian	147	109	74.2	38	25.8	50.0	13.2	21.0	7.9	5.3	------	2.6

[1] Number of replies for each reason expressed as a percentage of the total number replying "Yes."
[2] Replies from 10 cities: Birmingham, Denver, Fargo, Grand Forks, Lincoln, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Oklahoma City, San Francisco, and Washington.
[3] Replies from Birmingham, New Orleans, and Washington.
[4] Replies from Minneapolis and San Francisco.
[5] Replies from Denver and San Francisco.

TABLE 28.—*Replies to the question: Why did you stop buying from your last meat dealer?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—										
		Family moved	Dealer quit business	Poor quality meats	Shop inconveniently located	Prices high	Poor service	Business connections	New shop opened up	Insanitary shop	No credit service	New dealer recommended
American white:[1]												
Poor class	414	64.7	10.6	3.4	6.5	4.8	3.2	2.0	2.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
Middle class	420	61.9	7.9	8.8	6.7	5.2	4.5	2.4	.7	1.0	.7	.2
Well-to-do class	444	62.6	4.7	8.4	7.2	8.6	3.6	3.4	1.1	------	.2	.2
Wealthy class	372	54.8	9.9	10.0	5.9	4.0	9.7	3.5	.8	.8	.3	.3
Total American white	1,650	61.2	8.2	7.6	6.6	5.8	5.1	2.8	1.3	.6	.5	.3
Colored:[2]												
Poor class	128	62.5	8.6	8.6	5.5	12.5	------	1.5	.8	------	------	------
Middle class	105	43.8	16.2	14.3	11.4	4.7	------	1.0	7.6	1.0	------	------
Foreign:												
English	70	58.6	2.9	7.1	4.3	5.7	20.6	------	------	1.4	------	------
Finnish	11	72.7	------	------	18.2	------	------	------	9.1	------	------	------
French	36	72.2	5.5	8.3	2.8	2.8	2.8	------	5.6	------	------	------
German	112	68.8	5.3	4.5	7.1	5.3	4.5	1.8	2.7	------	------	------
Italian[3]	101	59.4	3.9	10.9	3.0	8.9	10.9	1.0	2.0	------	------	------
Jewish[4]	74	52.7	2.7	5.4	8.1	21.6	6.8	2.7	------	------	------	------
Polish[5]	44	63.6	------	8.2	------	11.4	4.5	2.3	------	------	------	------
Russian	30	63.4	10.0	------	3.3	------	------	3.3	20.0	------	------	------
Scandinavian	69	49.3	11.6	7.2	10.1	2.9	4.4	4.4	8.7	------	------	1.4

[1] Replies from 12 cities: Birmingham, Denver, Fargo, Grand Forks, Lincoln, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Oklahoma City, Philadelphia, Pitttsburg, San Francisco, and Washington.
[2] Replies from Birmingham, New Orleans, and Washington.
[3] Replies from Denver, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and San Francisco.
[4] Replies from Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.
[5] Replies from Grand Forks and Minneapolis.

TABLE 29.—*Replies to the question: Where have you seen fresh meat advertised by local stores?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—				
		Posters in shops	Newspapers	Handbills and circulars	Street-car posters	Motion-picture shows
American white:[1]						
Poor class	247	72.9	20.6	6.5	----------	----------
Middle class	310	75.8	12.9	10.0	1.3	----------
Well-to-do class	315	72.1	21.3	6.0	.6	----------
Wealthy class	271	71.2	26.2	1.5	.4	0.7
Total American white	1,143	73.1	20.0	6.1	.6	.2
Colored:[2]						
Poor Class	74	44.6	12.2	41.9	1.3	------
Middle class	102	52.0	17.6	29.4	----------	1.0
Foreign:						
Finnish	23	95.6	4.4	----------	----------	----------
French	22	86.4	----------	4.5	4.5	4.6
German[3]	34	61.8	32.3	5.9	----------	----------
Italian[4]	31	12.9	83.9	3.2	----------	----------
Russian	22	68.2	4.6	22.7	4.5	----------
Scandinavian	82	81.7	11.0	7.3	----------	----------

[1] Replies from 10 cities: Birmingham, Denver, Fargo, Grand Forks, Lincoln, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Oklahoma City, San Francisco, and Washington.
[2] Replies from Birmingham, New Orleans, and Washington.
[3] Replies from Minneapolis and San Francisco.
[4] Replies from Denver and San Francisco.

TABLE 30.—*Replies by cities to the question: Where have you seen fresh meat advertised by local stores?*

[Middle class and well-to-do class American white replies combined]

City	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—			
		Posters in shops	Newspapers	Handbills and circulars	Street-car posters
Birmingham	90	84.4	15.6		
Denver	80	38.8	31.2	30.0	
Fargo	44	97.8	2.2		
Grand Forks	85	94.1	5.9		
Lincoln	66	95.5	4.5		
Minneapolis	73	54.8	24.6	19.2	1.4
New Orleans	52	86.6	9.6		3.8
Oklahoma City	60	73.3	25.0		1.7
San Francisco	46	65.2	26.1	8.7	
Washington	29	34.5	31.0	27.6	6.9
All cities	625	73.9	17.1	8.0	1.0

TABLE 31.—*Replies to the question: What do you remember about meat advertising by local stores?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—							
		Reasonable prices	Specials	List of prices	Quality	Attractive display	Cheap cuts and prices	Charts of cuts	Government inspected
American white:[1]									
Poor class	171	49.1	24.0	15.2	5.8	1.2	2.3	1.8	0.6
Middle class	218	48.2	22.0	19.3	5.6	2.7	.9	.9	.4
Well-to-do class	242	43.4	25.2	18.2	3.3	3.7	2.5	3.3	.4
Wealthy class	205	49.7	29.7	10.7	4.4	1.5	2.0	1.5	.5
Total American white	836	47.4	25.2	16.0	4.7	2.4	1.9	1.9	.5
Colored:[2]									
Poor class	40	55.0	20.0	22.5			2.5		
Middle class	54	51.9	22.2	18.5	3.7	3.7			
Foreign:									
Finnish	21	61.9	23.9		9.5		4.7		
French	14	71.4		14.3	7.1			7.2	
German[3]	20	65.0	15.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	5.0		
Italian[4]	21	52.4	14.3	3.3					
Russian	11	72.7		9.1	18.2				
Scandinavian	56	48.2	33.9	8.9	7.2			1.8	

[1] Replies from 10 cities, Birmingham, Denver, Fargo, Grand Forks, Lincoln, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Oklahoma City, San Francisco, and Washington.
[2] Replies from Birmingham, New Orleans, and Washington.
[3] Replies from Minneapolis and San Francisco.
[4] Replies from Denver and San Francisco.

TABLE 32.—*Replies to the question: If you owned a market, what would you advertise about your meat?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—								
		Good quality	Sanitary handling	Economical prices	Government inspected	Food value	Variety	Good service	Reliability	Special prices
American white:[1]	363	52.1	17.1	15.1	5.5	4.1	2.2	0.6	2.7	0.6
Poor class	417	50.0	26.1	13.9	4.3	2.2	2.4	.2	.7	.2
Middle class	424	56.3	31.4	2.6	4.5	.5	1.6	2.1	.5	.5
Well-to-do class	411	56.5	33.1	2.4	3.9	.5	.2	2.2	1.0	.2
Wealthy class										
Total American white	1,615	53.7	27.4	8.3	4.5	1.7	1.6	1.3	1.2	.4
Colored:[2]										
Poor class	130	55.4	29.2	8.5	-------	.8	6.1	-------	-------	-------
Middle class	142	57.1	33.8	5.6	-------	-------	2.1	1.4	-------	-------
Foreign:										
Finnish	33	75.8	12.1	6.1	-------	-------	3.0	3.0	-------	-------
French	31	71.0	3.2	9.7	-------	-------	16.1	-------	-------	-------
German[3]	73	52.0	43.8	-------	-------	-------	1.4	1.4	1.4	-------
Italian[4]	35	77.1	5.7	17.2	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Russian	28	57.1	35.7	7.2	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Scandinavian	116	36.2	34.5	21.5	.9	.9	3.4	1.7	.9	-------

[1] Replies from 10 cities: Birmingham, Denver, Fargo, Grand Forks, Lincoln, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Oklahoma City, San Francisco, and Washington.
[2] Replies from Birmingham, New Orleans, and Washington.
[3] Replies from Minneapolis and San Francisco.
[4] Replies from Denver.

TABLE 33.—*Replies by cities to the question: If you owned a market, what would you advertise about your meat?*

[Middle class and well-to-do class American white replies combined]

City	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—								
		Good quality	Sanitary handling	Economical prices	Government inspected meats	Variety of meats	Food value	Good Service	Reliability	Specials
Birmingham	100	62.0	36.0	-------	2.0	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Denver	86	75.6	11.6	3.5	7.0	-------	-------	-------	2.3	-------
Fargo	83	28.9	35.0	24.1	3.6	1.2	-------	6.0	-------	1.2
Grand Forks	91	58.2	28.6	5.5	3.3	2.2	-------	2.2	-------	-------
Lincoln	100	69.0	29.0	2.0	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Minneapolis	86	52.3	38.3	-------	4.6	1.2	1.2	1.2	-------	1.2
New Orleans	87	21.9	13.8	37.9	6.9	6.9	8.0	2.3	2.3	-------
Oklahoma City	82	54.9	31.8	2.4	2.4	6.1	-------	-------	1.2	1.2
San Francisco	91	44.0	36.1	3.4	12.1	2.2	2.2	-------	-------	-------
Washington	35	71.4	22.8	2.9	-------	-------	2.9	-------	-------	-------
All cities	841	53.1	28.8	8.2	4.4	2.0	1.3	1.2	.6	.4

TABLE 34.—*Replies to the question: How do you purchase meat?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—					
		Housewife personally	Phone orders	Husband buys	Children	Servants	Various
American white:							
Poor class[1]	700	68.8	4.4	12.3	10.9	0.3	3.3
Middle class[1]	732	65.7	16.0	10.4	4.9	----	3.0
Well-to-do class[1]	745	53.0	34.1	8.5	1.3	.5	2.6
Wealthy class[2]	533	37.1	52.7	3.6	.2	4.3	2.1
Total American white	2,710	57.4	25.2	9.0	4.5	1.1	2.8
Colored:							
Poor class	202	70.8	1.0	15.3	10.9	.5	1.5
Middle class	197	74.6	1.0	13.2	6.6	.5	4.1
Foreign:							
English[3]	50	88.0	12.0	----	----	----	----
Finnish	45	82.2	4.4	8.9	4.5	----	----
French	50	42.0	32.0	6.0	2.0	6.0	12.0
German	150	70.0	10.0	4.7	14.0	----	1.3
Italian[4]	226	73.4	1.8	11.7	8.8	----	4.9
Jewish[5]	61	78.7	14.8	1.6	4.9	----	----
Polish[5]	150	88.0	.7	----	8.6	----	2.7
Russian	50	42.0	20.0	6.0	26.0	----	6.0
Scandinavian	149	54.4	20.1	22.8	2.0	----	.7

[1] Replies from 15 cities, Philadelphia not included.
[2] Replies from 12 cities, Binghamton, Birmingham, Denver, Fargo, Grand Forks, Lincoln, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Oklahoma City, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, and Washington.
[3] Replies from Pittsburgh.
[4] Replies from Baltimore, Binghamton, Denver, Pittsburgh, and San Francisco.
[5] Replies from Baltimore, Binghamton, and Pittsburgh.

TABLE 35.—*Replies by cities to the question: How do you purchase meat?*

[Middle class and well-to-do class American white replies combined]

City	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—					
		Housewife personally	Phone orders	Husband buys	Children	Servants	Various
Baltimore	94	74.5	14.9	5.3	----	----	5.3
Binghamton	89	49.5	23.6	21.3	1.1	----	4.5
Birmingham	99	51.5	24.2	16.1	4.1	----	4.1
Denver	97	60.8	21.6	13.4	2.1	----	2.1
Fargo	100	43.0	38.0	14.0	4.0	1.0	----
Grand Forks	101	28.7	45.6	18.8	6.9	----	----
Jacksonville	99	61.6	25.2	7.1	6.1	----	----
Lincoln	100	56.0	28.0	14.0	2.0	----	----
Minneapolis	100	65.0	29.0	4.0	1.0	----	1.0
New Haven	103	73.8	20.4	3.8	1.0	----	1.0
New Orleans	100	36.0	44.0	6.0	1.0	3.0	10.0
Oklahoma City	100	66.0	24.0	4.0	5.0	----	1.0
Pittsburgh	98	83.6	7.2	2.0	4.1	----	3.1
San Francisco	100	62.0	24.0	5.0	2.0	----	7.0
Washington	97	78.4	5.1	7.2	6.2	----	3.1
All cities	1,477	59.3	25.1	9.4	3.1	.3	2.8

TABLE 36.—*Replies to the question: When you purchase meat, is your mind made up to buy beef, pork, etc., before you go to the store?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—		
		Yes	Partly	No
American white:				
Poor class	732	68.4	15.2	16.4
Middle class	776	66.2	19.6	14.2
Well-to-do class	785	73.2	15.8	11.0
Wealthy class[1]	577	80.2	9.2	10.6
Total American white	2,870	71.5	15.3	13.2
Colored:				
Poor class	203	52.7	15.8	31.5
Middle class	197	54.8	17.8	27.4
Foreign:				
English	96	71.8	16.7	11.5
Finnish	45	64.4	13.4	22.2
French	50	58.0	16.0	26.0
German	171	70.7	17.0	12.3
Italian	266	56.0	12.4	31.6
Jewish	109	41.3	27.5	31.2
Polish	192	73.4	9.9	16.7
Russian	50	72.0	14.0	14.0
Scandinavian	150	68.6	16.7	14.7

[1] Replies from 13 cities; Baltimore, Jacksonville, and New Haven not included.

TABLE 37.—*Replies by cities to the question: When you purchase meat, is your mind made up to buy beef, pork, etc., before you go to the store?*

[Middle class and well-to-do class American white replies combined]

City	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—		
		Yes	Partly	No
Baltimore	94	74.5	11.7	13.8
Binghamton	89	56.2	21.3	22.5
Birmingham	100	80.0	11.0	9.0
Denver	97	57.7	34.0	8.3
Fargo	92	85.9	7.6	6.5
Grand Forks	101	66.4	20.8	12.8
Jacksonville	99	76.8	11.1	12.1
Lincoln	100	77.0	17.0	6.0
Minneapolis	100	63.0	22.0	15.0
New Haven	103	73.8	4.8	21.4
New Orleans	100	60.0	24.0	16.0
Oklahoma City	100	69.0	14.0	17.0
Philadelphia	93	65.5	24.8	9.7
Pittsburgh	94	54.3	35.1	10.6
San Francisco	100	64.0	21.0	15.0
Washington	99	90.9	4.0	5.1
All cities	1,561	69.8	17.7	12.5

TABLE 38.—*Replies to the question: When you purchase meat, is your mind made up to buy boiling meat, roast, fry, etc., before you go to the store?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—		
		Yes	Partly	No
American white:				
Poor class	735	70.7	12.0	17.3
Middle class	774	71.6	16.9	11.5
Well-to-do class	785	78.0	13.0	9.0
Wealthy class [1]	575	81.1	8.5	10.4
Total American white	2,869	75.0	12.9	12.1
Colored:				
Poor class	203	53.7	18.7	27.6
Middle class	197	58.4	20.3	21.3
Foreign:				
English	96	70.8	15.6	13.6
Finnish	45	71.1	11.1	17.8
French	50	56.0	20.0	24.0
German	171	73.7	14.0	12.3
Italian	264	49.3	14.4	36.3
Jewish	109	38.5	32.1	29.4
Polish	194	76.8	8.8	14.4
Russian	50	76.0	14.0	10.0
Scandinavian	150	77.3	14.0	8.7

[1] Replies from 13 cities; Baltimore, Jacksonville, and New Haven not included.

TABLE 39.—*Replies by cities to the question: When you purchase meat, is your mind made up to buy boiling meat, roast, fry, etc., before you go to the store?*

[Middle class and well-to-do class American white replies combined]

City	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—		
		Yes	Partly	No
Baltimore	94	74.5	11.7	13.8
Binghamton	89	60.7	19.1	20.2
Birmingham	100	82.0	8.0	10.0
Denver	97	63.9	28.9	7.2
Fargo	92	83.6	12.0	4.4
Grand Forks	101	81.2	15.8	3.0
Jacksonville	99	85.8	5.1	9.1
Lincoln	100	86.0	11.0	3.0
Minneapolis	100	70.0	17.0	13.0
New Haven	103	75.7	5.8	18.5
New Orleans	100	59.0	25.0	16.0
Oklahoma City	100	82.0	7.0	11.0
Philadelphia	93	63.5	27.9	8.6
Pittsburgh	92	60.9	31.5	7.6
San Francisco	100	72.0	13.0	15.0
Washington	99	93.0	3.0	4.0
All cities	1,559	74.8	14.9	10.3

TABLE 40.—*Replies to the question: When you purchase meat, do you buy at specially advertised prices?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—		
		Never	Occasionally	Often
American white:				
Poor class	738	70.5	22.6	6.9
Middle class	767	76.5	22.2	1.3
Well-to-do class	778	79.9	18.9	1.2
Wealthy class [1]	577	88.7	11.3	----
Total American white	2,860	78.3	19.2	2.5
Colored:				
Poor class	202	68.8	19.3	11.9
Middle class	196	76.5	19.9	3.6
Foreign:				
English	95	63.2	25.2	11.6
Finnish	45	75.6	24.4	----
French	50	100.0	----	----
German	172	67.4	27.9	4.7
Italian	240	71.7	12.9	15.4
Jewish	97	73.2	18.6	8.2
Polish	183	63.4	19.7	16.9
Russian	50	80.0	20.0	----
Scandinavian	150	59.3	40.7	----

[1] Replies from 13 cities; Baltimore, Jacksonville, and New Haven not included.

TABLE 41.—*Replies by cities to the question: When you purchase meat, do you buy at specially advertised prices?*

[Middle class and well-to-do class American white replies combined]

City	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—		
		Never	Occasionally	Often
Baltimore	94	85.1	10.6	4.3
Binghamton	85	77.7	18.8	3.5
Birmingham	100	73.0	27.0	----
Denver	96	89.6	10.4	----
Fargo	92	65.2	34.8	----
Grand Forks	101	59.4	40.6	----
Jacksonville	99	88.8	6.1	5.1
Lincoln	100	68.0	31.0	1.0
Minneapolis	100	74.0	26.0	----
New Haven	99	93.9	6.1	----
New Orleans	100	96.0	4.0	----
Oklahoma City	100	67.0	33.0	----
Philadelphia	92	52.2	46.7	1.1
Pittsburgh	91	70.3	26.4	3.3
San Francisco	98	95.9	3.1	1.0
Washington	98	92.9	5.1	1.0
All cities	1,545	78.3	20.5	1.2

TABLE 42.—*Replies to the question: When you purchase meat, are you influenced by meat displays?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—		
		No	Yes	Partly
American white:				
Poor class	741	42.4	43.2	14.4
Middle class	773	47.3	31.3	21.4
Well-to-do class	778	51.9	30.5	17.6
Wealthy class[1]	577	57.7	28.3	14.0
Total American white	2,869	49.4	33.5	17.1
Colored:				
Poor class	202	32.2	50.0	17.8
Middle class	197	36.0	43.7	20.3
Foreign:				
English	95	58.9	16.9	24.2
Finnish	45	26.7	40.0	33.3
French	50	48.0	40.0	12.0
German	171	59.6	24.0	16.4
Italian	253	36.4	49.8	13.8
Jewish	107	72.9	13.1	14.0
Polish	185	60.0	31.9	8.1
Russian	50	48.0	36.0	16.0
Scandinavian	150	41.3	33.3	25.4

[1] Replies from 13 cities; Baltimore, Jacksonville, and New Haven not included.

TABLE 43.—*Replies by cities to the question: When you purchase meat, are you influenced by meat display?*

[Middle class and well-to-do class American white replies combined]

City	Total number replies of	Percentage replying—		
		No	Yes	Partly
Baltimore	91	53.8	39.6	6.6
Binghampton	88	42.1	39.7	18.2
Birmingham	100	30.0	61.0	9.0
Denver	96	45.8	25.0	29.2
Fargo	92	17.4	56.5	26.1
Grand Forks	100	47.0	25.0	28.0
Jacksonville	99	78.8	13.1	8.1
Lincoln	100	40.0	41.0	19.0
Minneapolis	99	50.6	26.2	23.2
New Haven	103	65.0	21.4	13.6
New Orleans	100	44.0	32.0	24.0
Oklahoma City	100	37.0	46.0	17.0
Philadelphia	93	65.6	2.1	32.3
Pittsburgh	94	44.7	23.4	31.9
San Francisco	98	55.1	27.6	17.3
Washington	98	75.5	15.3	9.2
All cities	1,551	49.6	30.9	19.5

TABLE 44.—*Replies to the question: When you purchase meat, are you influenced by salesmen?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—		
		No	Yes	Sometimes
American white:				
Poor class	741	72.1	21.0	6.9
Middle class	772	75.9	14.0	10.1
Well-to-do class	781	72.1	16.6	11.3
Wealthy class [1]	576	75.3	12.8	11.9
Total American white	2,870	73.8	16.3	9.9
Colored:				
Poor class	203	81.8	8.0	10.2
Middle class	197	79.2	13.7	7.1
Foreign:				
English	94	81.9	3.2	14.9
Finnish	45	88.9	8.9	2.2
French	50	70.0	20.0	10.0
German	172	81.4	8.1	10.5
Italian	261	69.0	21.1	9.9
Jewish	111	86.5	7.2	6.3
Polish	188	87.3	10.1	2.6
Russian	50	82.0	12.0	6.0
Scandinavian	149	72.5	12.7	14.8

[1] Replies from 13 cities; Baltimore, Jacksonville, and New Haven not included.

TABLE 45.—*Replies by cities to the question: When you purchase meat, are you influenced by salesmen?*

[Middle class and well-to-do class American white replies combined]

City	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—		
		No	Yes	Sometimes
Baltimore	91	87.9	8.8	3.3
Binghamton	87	75.9	10.3	13.8
Birmingham	100	76.0	15.0	9.0
Denver	97	70.0	16.5	13.5
Fargo	92	42.4	33.7	23.9
Grand Forks	101	83.2	8.9	7.9
Jacksonville	98	87.8	10.2	2.0
Lincoln	100	76.0	16.0	8.0
Minneapolis	99	78.8	14.1	7.1
New Haven	103	83.5	10.7	5.8
New Orleans	100	61.0	22.0	17.0
Oklahoma City	100	71.0	19.0	10.0
Philadelphia	92	78.3	5.4	16.3
Pittsburgh	95	71.6	8.4	20.0
San Francisco	100	75.0	11.0	14.0
Washington	98	64.3	34.7	1.0
All cities	1,553	74.0	15.3	10.7

TABLE 46.—*Replies to the question: When you purchase meat, are you influenced by price?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—		
		No	Yes	Partly
American white:				
Poor class	742	40.7	47.2	12.1
Middle class	772	53.4	22.4	24.2
Well-to-do class	784	61.9	21.5	16.6
Wealthy class[1]	577	77.3	11.1	11.6
Total American white	2,875	57.2	26.3	16.5
Colored:				
Poor class	203	33.5	47.3	19.2
Middle class	197	54.3	31.0	14.7
Foreign:				
English	96	43.8	14.6	41.6
Finnish	45	57.8	33.3	8.9
French	50	76.0	16.0	8.0
German	172	54.1	22.1	23.8
Italian	256	50.8	37.1	12.1
Jewish	108	65.8	25.9	8.3
Polish	190	58.9	23.2	17.9
Russian	50	56.0	36.0	8.0
Scandinavian	149	30.2	42.9	26.9

[1] Replies from 13 cities; Baltimore, Jacksonville, and New Haven not included.

TABLE 47.—*Replies by cities to the question: When you purchase meat, are you influenced by price?*

[Middle class and well-to-do class American white replies combined]

City	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—		
		No	Yes	Partly
Baltimore	93	66.7	26.9	6.4
Binghamton	87	55.2	23.0	21.8
Birmingham	100	64.0	15.0	21.0
Denver	97	59.8	16.5	23.7
Fargo	92	31.5	33.7	34.8
Grand Forks	101	46.5	20.8	32.7
Jacksonville	99	68.7	19.2	12.1
Lincoln	100	55.0	22.0	23.0
Minneapolis	100	62.0	25.0	13.0
New Haven	103	67.9	7.8	24.3
New Orleans	100	71.0	15.0	14.0
Oklahoma City	100	58.0	27.0	15.0
Philadelphia	92	46.7	19.6	33.7
Pittsburgh	93	47.3	19.4	33.3
San Francisco	100	67.0	15.0	18.0
Washington	99	51.5	46.5	2.0
All cities	1,556	57.6	21.9	20.5

TABLE 48.—*Replies to the question: When you purchase meat, do you shop between stores?*

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—		
		None	Some	Much
American white:				
Poor class	741	51.4	33.3	15.3
Middle class	767	51.3	34.2	14.5
Well-to-do class	777	57.3	31.8	10.9
Wealthy class[1]	575	70.6	23.7	5.7
Total American white	2,860	56.9	31.2	11.9
Colored:				
Poor class	203	31.4	48.4	20.2
Middle class	197	35.5	47.2	17.3
Foreign:				
English	96	35.4	55.2	9.4
Finnish	45	68.9	22.2	8.9
French	50	70.0	26.0	4.0
German	165	54.5	35.8	9.7
Italian	260	31.5	48.5	20.0
Jewish	103	53.4	42.7	3.9
Polish	188	39.4	45.7	14.9
Russian	50	68.0	16.0	16.0
Scandinavian	150	60.6	34.7	4.7

[1] Replies from 13 cities; Baltimore, Jacksonville, and New Haven not included.

TABLE 49.—*Replies by cities to the question: When you purchase meat, do you shop between stores?*

[Middle class and well-to-do class American white replies combined]

City	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—		
		None	Some	Much
Baltimore	94	62.8	21.3	15.9
Binghamton	86	60.5	30.2	9.3
Birmingham	100	38.0	51.0	11.0
Denver	97	44.4	50.5	5.1
Fargo	91	47.2	46.2	6.6
Grand Forks	101	76.2	20.8	3.0
Jacksonville	97	75.3	17.5	7.2
Lincoln	100	38.0	21.0	41.0
Minneapolis	99	46.5	36.3	17.2
New Haven	103	64.1	33.0	2.9
New Orleans	100	49.0	36.0	15.0
Oklahoma City	100	44.0	27.0	29.0
Philadelphia	93	47.3	43.0	9.7
Pittsburgh	87	37.9	50.6	11.5
San Francisco	98	52.1	31.6	16.3
Washington	98	84.7	14.3	1.0
All cities	1,544	54.3	33.0	12.7

TABLE 50.—*Replies to the question: When you purchase meat, do you buy by pound or portion?* [1]

Group	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—	
		Pound	Portion
American white:			
Poor class	183	92.3	7.7
Middle class	184	83.7	16.3
Well-to-do class	199	73.9	26.1
Total American white	566	83.0	17.0
Colored: [2]			
Poor class	53	88.7	11.3
Middle class	47	91.5	8.5
Foreign:			
Italian	99	91.9	8.1
Polish	96	94.8	5.2

[1] Replies from Baltimore, Binghamton, Jacksonville, and New Haven.
[2] Replies from Jacksonville only.

TABLE 51.—*Replies by cities to the question: When you purchase meat, do you buy by pound or portion?*

[Middle class and well-to-do class American white replies combined]

City	Total number of replies	Percentage replying—	
		Pound	Portion
Baltimore	94	77.4	22.6
Binghamton	88	70.5	29.5
Jacksonville	98	84.8	15.2
New Haven	103	81.6	19.4
All cities	383	78.5	21.5

TABLE 52.—*Replies to the question: Name the kinds of beefsteaks and beef roasts you can recognize if cut*

Group	Beef steaks		Beef roasts	
	Total number of replies	Average number recognized per person	Total number of replies	Average number recognized per person
American white:				
Poor class	681	2.4	665	1.5
Middle class	769	3.0	754	2.1
Well-to-do class	780	3.5	770	2.5
Wealthy class [1]	557	3.4	429	3.3
Total American white	2,787	3.1	2,618	2.3
Colored:				
Poor class	194	2.0	182	0.9
Middle class	194	2.6	191	1.3
Foreign:				
English	57	3.9	66	3.4
Finnish	45	3.1	45	2.5
French	44	3.4	33	2.2
German	150	3.8	149	2.9
Italian	221	2.1	223	1.2
Jewish	59	2.6	59	2.1
Polish	142	2.0	145	1.4
Russian	50	2.5	50	1.9
Scandinavian	150	2.7	150	2.8

[1] Replies from 13 cities; Baltimore, Jacksonville, and New Haven not included.

○

ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

December 1, 1926

Secretary of Agriculture	W. M. JARDINE.
Assistant Secretary	R. W. DUNLAP.
Director of Scientific Work	A. F. WOODS
Director of Regulatory Work	WALTER G. CAMPBELL.
Director of Extension Work	C. W. WARBURTON.
Director of Information	NELSON ANTRIM CRAWFORD.
Director of Personnel and Business Administration	W. W. STOCKBERGER.
Solicitor	R. W. WILLIAMS.
Weather Bureau	CHARLES F. MARVIN, *Chief.*
Bureau of Agricultural Economics	LLOYD S. TENNY, *Acting Chief.*
Bureau of Animal Industry	JOHN R. MOHLER, *Chief.*
Bureau of Plant Industry	WILLIAM A. TAYLOR, *Chief.*
Forest Service	W. B. GREELEY, *Chief.*
Bureau of Chemistry	C. A. BROWNE, *Chief.*
Bureau of Soils	MILTON WHITNEY, *Chief.*
Bureau of Entomology	L. O. HOWARD, *Chief.*
Bureau of Biological Survey	E. W. NELSON, *Chief.*
Bureau of Public Roads	THOMAS H. MACDONALD, *Chief.*
Bureau of Home Economics	LOUISE STANLEY, *Chief.*
Bureau of Dairy Industry	C. W. LARSON, *Chief.*
Office of Experiment Stations	E. W. ALLEN, *Chief.*
Office of Cooperative Extension Work	C. B. SMITH, *Chief.*
Library	CLARIBEL R. BARNETT, *Librarian.*
Federal Horticultural Board	C. L. MARLATT, *Chairman.*
Insecticide and Fungicide Board	J. K. HAYWOOD, *Chairman.*
Packers and Stockyards Administration	JOHN T. CAINE III, *in Charge.*
Grain Futures Administration	J. W. T. DUVEL, *in Charge.*

This bulletin is a contribution from

Bureau of Agricultural Economics	LLOYD S. TENNY, *Acting Chief.*
Division of Economic Information	J. CLYDE MARQUIS, *in Charge.*

ADDITIONAL COPIES
OF THIS PUBLICATION MAY BE PROCURED FROM
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D. C.
AT
10 CENTS PER COPY